



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2008

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 10, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE HIRONO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Today at the beginning of another week of time and work, we stand before You, Lord God of the universe. We also stand before the world community. There is no way of separating ourselves from this reality.

The truth of our living today and the ensuing week is dependent upon our attitude of mind toward the world we live in. This attitude is a matter of habit, dealing with others and circumstances according to past experiences and ever-present pressures. Help us, Lord, to see how our attitude guides any attempt to form relationships or pattern progress for ourselves and the Nation.

Most often, Lord, this unconscious attitude places an emphasis either upon the principle of duality or upon the principle of unity. Either we view everyone and everything as a combative conquest or a realized connection. Every moment we approach the whole universe through a cultivation of controlling power or through growth in sympathy.

Once we know there are no winners or losers, the game never ends. It is all a matter of attitude. Life is either a competitive struggle or a simple joy both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARNAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 8, 2008, at 11 :30 a.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he returns without his approval, H.R. 2082, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008."

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-100)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2082, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008." The bill would impede the United States Government's efforts to protect the American people effectively from terrorist attacks and other threats because it imposes several unnecessary

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1419

and unacceptable burdens on our Intelligence Community.

Section 444 of the bill would impose additional Senate confirmation requirements on two national security positions—the Director of the National Security Agency and the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office. The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (9/11 Commission) observed that the effectiveness of the Intelligence Community suffers due to delays in the confirmation process; section 444 would only aggravate those serious problems. Senior intelligence officials need to assume their duties and responsibilities as quickly as possible to address the pressing requirements of national security. Instead of addressing the 9/11 Commission's concern, the bill would subject two additional vital positions to a more protracted process of Senate confirmation. Apart from causing such potentially harmful delays, this unwarranted requirement for Senate confirmation would also risk injecting political pressure into these positions of technical expertise and public trust.

Section 413 would create a new Inspector General for the Intelligence Community. This new office is duplicative and unnecessary. Each intelligence community component already has an Inspector General, and the Inspector General of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has been vested with all the legal powers of any inspector general to carry out investigations on matters under the jurisdiction of the Director of National Intelligence. There is no reason to commit taxpayer resources to an additional inspector general with competing jurisdiction over the same intelligence elements. Creating duplicative inspectors general, who may have inconsistent views on the handling of particular matters, has the potential to create conflicts and impede the Intelligence Community from efficiently resolving issues and carrying out its core mission. In addition, the creation of a new inspector general would add yet another position in the Intelligence Community subject to Senate confirmation, contrary to the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

Section 327 of the bill would harm our national security by requiring any element of the Intelligence Community to use only the interrogation methods authorized in the Army Field Manual on Interrogations. It is vitally important that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) be allowed to maintain a separate and classified interrogation program. The Army Field Manual is directed at guiding the actions of nearly three million active duty and reserve military personnel in connection with the detention of lawful combatants during the course of traditional armed conflicts, but terrorists often are trained specifically to resist techniques prescribed in publicly available military regulations such as the Manual. The CIA's ability to conduct a sep-

arate and specialized interrogation program for terrorists who possess the most critical information in the War on Terror has helped the United States prevent a number of attacks, including plots to fly passenger airplanes into the Library Tower in Los Angeles and into Heathrow Airport or buildings in downtown London. While details of the current CIA program are classified, the Attorney General has reviewed it and determined that it is lawful under existing domestic and international law, including Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. I remain committed to an intelligence-gathering program that complies with our legal obligations and our basic values as a people. The United States opposes torture, and I remain committed to following international and domestic law regarding the humane treatment of people in its custody, including the "Detainee Treatment Act of 2005."

My disagreement over section 327 is not over any particular interrogation technique; for instance, it is not over waterboarding, which is not part of the current CIA program. Rather, my concern is the need to maintain a separate CIA program that will shield from disclosure to al Qaeda and other terrorists the interrogation techniques they may face upon capture. In accordance with a clear purpose of the "Military Commissions Act of 2006," my veto is intended to allow the continuation of a separate and classified CIA interrogation program that the Department of Justice has determined is lawful and that operates according to rules distinct from the more general rules applicable to the Department of Defense. While I will continue to work with the Congress on the implementation of laws passed in this area in recent years, I cannot sign into law a bill that would prevent me, and future Presidents, from authorizing the CIA to conduct a separate, lawful intelligence program, and from taking all lawful actions necessary to protect Americans from attack.

Other provisions of the bill purport to require the executive branch to submit information to the Congress that may be constitutionally protected from disclosure, including information the disclosure of which could impair foreign relations, the national security, the deliberative processes of the Executive, or the performance of the Executive's constitutional duties. Section 326, for example, would require that the executive branch report, on a very short deadline and in accordance with a rigid set of specific statutory requirements, the details of highly classified interrogation techniques and the confidential legal advice concerning them. The executive branch voluntarily has provided much of this information to appropriate Members of Congress, demonstrating that questions concerning access to such information are best addressed through the customary practices and arrangements between the executive and legislative branches on

such matters, rather than through the enactment of legislation.

In addition, section 406 would require a consolidated inventory of Special Access Programs (SAPs) to be submitted to the Congress. Special Access Programs concern the most sensitive information maintained by the Government, and SAP materials are maintained separately precisely to avoid the existence of one document that can serve as a roadmap to our Nation's most vital information. The executive branch must be permitted to present this information in a manner that does not jeopardize national security. The executive branch will continue to keep the Congress appropriately informed of the matters to which the provisions relate in accordance with the accommodation principles the Constitution contemplates and the executive and legislative branches have long and successfully used to address information sharing on matters of national security.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message and the bill be postponed until Tuesday, March 11, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

□ 1415

AIRBUS WINS AIR FORCE CONTRACT OVER BOEING

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, a week ago Friday, the market dropped 400-plus points, and the Air Force announced its award of a refueling aircraft contract to foreign-based Airbus over U.S.-based Boeing. At a time when we are working on national economic stimulus plans for our sagging economy, outsourcing vital defense work and good-paying jobs raises questions that are both troubling and alarming. Their decision to reward foreign interests by spending \$40 billion abroad has been ridiculed. Many today are still shaking their heads. It reminds me of a time not long ago when we were being asked to relinquish control of our ports. This latest debacle doesn't make sense, and it is not good for our country.

Air Force officials have agreed to move up a debriefing with Boeing officials to explain why they would outsource the construction of 179 aerial tankers abroad. Adding insult to injury, many believe the Air Force decision will end up actually buying a more costly and less capable aircraft.

Many Members are disturbed by what has transpired as a result of this deal. It degrades our national defense industry. It diminishes economic development opportunities and jobs here at home. When will we insist on putting America's interests first? This Congress should act swiftly and responsibly to review and to stop this questionable contract award.

JUDGES' HALL OF SHAME— MARILYN MACKEL

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, judges should keep politics out of their judicial decisions, but not so with California Judge Marilyn Mackel. She is a loud opponent of U.S. liberation of Iraq. So when Shawn Sage, a foster child of 17, appeared before her to obtain permission to early enlist in the United States Marine Corps, she summarily denounced his request and told him she was opposed to the war in Iraq.

Shawn appeared in court with his supporting foster parents just to be insulted by a judge who makes decisions based on politics. Judge Mackel is a repeat offender, however. Judge "Gone Wild" Mackel has shown prejudice against the military before when she prevented a foster child from joining the United States Navy, all because of a political bias.

As a former judge, it appears to me the abuse of power by this anti-American military, peacenik judge is the perfect example of her having a terminal case of black robe disease, a disease some judges get when their personal politics cloud their judgment. Keep politics and wacky judges out of the courthouse. Judge Mackel is the newest member of the Judges' Hall of Shame.

And that's just the way it is.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I voted for the President's economic stimulus package, and I think it is going to actually help some people, but not nearly enough. In my city and in other major cities throughout the country, unemployment among young people is at an all-time high.

For example, in Chicago, more than 50 percent of the young African American males between the ages of 16 and 22 do not go to school and do not work. We want to stimulate the economy. Let us put young people to work, and I guarantee that will help.

FISA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, for over 20 days, the majority leadership in this House has refused to bring a permanent fix to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to the floor. Everyone knows that the bill which passed the Senate would pass the House with bipartisan support. Yet, we have seen no action on the part of the majority. We need to send a clear message to our law enforcement, to our military, and to our intelligence community that they will have every lawful resource necessary to do their jobs and to protect American families. We need to send a clear message to our friends and to our enemies that America will do everything possible to stop those who have declared war on all Americans anywhere, anytime. It is misguided to obstruct our ability to track our enemies out of an unfounded fear that our intelligence community has the intent and the time to go spying on everyday Americans. The original FISA law addresses those concerns. This fix to FISA is about tracking potential terrorists overseas and not punishing individuals and businesses that would cooperate with our government.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

THE EXPIRATION OF THE PROTECT AMERICA ACT

(Ms. FALLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FALLIN. Madam Speaker, it has been well over 20 days since the Protect America Act expired. For 3 weeks and counting, this Congress has allowed the quality of our surveillance programs to erode. As a result, our intelligence agencies have lost critical tools in the war on terror and are left potentially blind to lethal terrorist plots. In light of these dangers, Democrat leaders are facing a chorus of Members demanding action on the bipartisan Senate-passed surveillance bill.

Madam Speaker, it is time that we bring this bill to the floor. The Democrat chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee has said that passing this legislation is the right way to go in terms of the security of our Nation. In the House, over 20 Democrats have publicly urged Speaker PELOSI to bring the bill up for a vote. In fact, it seems that the Democrat leadership will not bring this bill up precisely because they know it will pass.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. We have floated temporary patches and Band-Aids for months. It is time to get serious about our national security. It is time to bring a permanent fix to FISA and to a vote on this floor.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 7, 2008, at 3:20 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2733.

Appointments:

Public Interest Declassification Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE SILVESTRE REYES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable SILVESTRE REYES, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

NATIONAL 9-1-1 EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 537) expressing support for the designation and goals of "National 9-1-1 Education Month", and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 537

Whereas 9-1-1 is nationally recognized as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from police, fire, emergency medical services, or other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a "single number should be established" nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and other Federal Government agencies and various governmental officials also supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) announced that it would establish the digits 9-1-1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas 9-1-1 was designated by Congress as the national emergency call number under the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-81);

Whereas the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-494) established enhanced 9-1-1 as "a high national priority" as part of our Nation's homeland security and public safety;

Whereas it is important that policy makers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9-1-1, how the system works today, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9-1-1 system;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and emergency responders, and is a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas there are over 6,000 9-1-1 public safety answering points (PSAPs) serving more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas PSAPs answer more than 200,000,000 9-1-1 calls each year in the United States, and a growing number of 9-1-1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population, including the deaf, hard of hearing, and deaf-blind, and individuals with speech disabilities, are increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services, and anticipate that these services will be able to connect directly to 9-1-1;

Whereas the growth and variety of means of communication, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose challenges for accessing 9-1-1 and implementing enhanced 9-1-1, and require increased education and awareness about their capabilities and limitations;

Whereas numerous other N-1-1 and 800 number services exist for non-emergency situations, including 2-1-1, 3-1-1, 5-1-1, 7-1-1, 8-1-1, poison control centers, and mental health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use these services in addition to or instead of 9-1-1;

Whereas international visitors and individuals immigrating to the United States make up an increasing part of the Nation's population in any given year, and such visitors and individuals may have limited knowledge of our emergency calling system;

Whereas people of all ages use 9-1-1, and it is critical to educate members of the public of all ages on the proper use of 9-1-1;

Whereas thousands of 9-1-1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9-1-1, resulting in lives saved, and which, in turn, underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9-1-1;

Whereas there is a need to reduce the widespread misuse of the 9-1-1 system, including

prank and non-emergency calls, which can result in costly and inefficient use of 9-1-1 and emergency response resources;

Whereas we as a Nation should strive to host at least 1 educational event in every school in the country each year regarding the proper use of 9-1-1;

Whereas an established National 9-1-1 Education Month could include public awareness events, including conferences and media outreach, training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, care givers, children, the elderly, and businesses; educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and production and distribution of educational content on 9-1-1 designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9-1-1; and

Whereas Americans deserve the finest the Nation can offer in 9-1-1 education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of an appropriate month as "National 9-1-1 Education Month" and the goals of such designation; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation—

(A) designating a month as "National 9-1-1 Education Month"; and

(B) calling upon Government officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, care givers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Now I would yield myself such time as I might consume.

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H. Res. 537, as amended, which expresses the House's support for the designation and goals of National 9-1-1 Month.

H. Res. 537 was introduced by Representative ANNA ESHOO of the great State of California on July 11, 2007, and has the support and cosponsorship of nearly 60 Members of Congress. Upon introduction, the measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform where it was passed by the panel by voice vote after having been amended on February 26, 2008.

Madam Speaker, it is only fitting that we consider this resolution today, as it makes the important point of highlighting National 9-1-1 Month as a way of reminding everybody of the significance these three small numbers hold in times of emergency and distress.

Whether young or old, the number 9-1-1, which had its first debut back in 1968 when AT&T, under the encouragement of Congress, established the digits as the Nation's emergency telephone number, is known by most Americans as the number to ring when someone needs a fire, police, or ambulance response right away because of a threat to health, safety, or property. There are countless stories that I am sure we can all recall where children as young as 3 or 4 have remembered to pick up the phone and dial the numerical sequence of 9-1-1, thereby saving the lives of parents, grandparents, caretakers, and siblings.

Further, urging support for National 9-1-1 Month education would be futile if we failed to mention the commitment and diligence of the thousands of persons that serve on the other end of the 9-1-1 line. By simply doing their jobs, these 9-1-1 call takers are saving lives every hour of every day by dispatching emergency first responders and by providing verbal support and comfort in some of the most perilous moments of our lives.

As localities and communities across our great country consistently search for ways to make the 9-1-1 calling system more efficient, reliable and well-known, let us do our part in elevating the importance of the numbers 9-1-1 by passing the measure at hand, which expresses the support of the entire House of Representatives for the designation and goals of National 9-1-1 Month.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this resolution expressing support for the designation and goals of National 9-1-1 Education Month. Every day across this great Nation, lives are saved thanks to this simple, yet vital, support service.

Recommended in 1967 by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and established a year later by AT&T, 9-1-1 has continued to evolve as an integral part of America's vital emergency response and homeland security. Each year over 200 million calls are received by the 6,000-plus public safety answering points across the country. These calls come from people of all walks of life, young and old, wealthy and poor. As this service is a vital access point for the public to reach a public safety official during a time of need, it is critical that we continue to educate our citizens on the services 9-1-1 provides and the appropriate uses of the number.

We must also continue to modernize this vital tool. There is a growing population of citizens, otherwise unable to communicate clearly, who are learning to communicate through new technologies such as text, video, and instant messaging. We should strive to connect the use of emerging technologies to the 9-1-1 system.

Madam Speaker, once again, increased awareness and understanding of this service will help save lives and increase national security. For this reason, I support this resolution and ask that my colleagues do the same.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to have sponsored this Resolution to establish a National 9-1-1 Education Month.

Forty years ago President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Justice recommended that a single, nationwide telephone number be established for reporting emergencies—9-1-1. Since then, 9-1-1 has been used by millions of people across the country to quickly and efficiently contact their local fire and police departments, as well as report emergencies in their communities. Over 200 million emergency calls are made each year through the 6,000 9-1-1 public safety answering points serving more than 3,000 counties.

As the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the U.S., 9-1-1 answering points are often the first to know of emergencies caused by natural disasters, to national security threats, making 9-1-1 a vital homeland security asset. Educating people of all ages and backgrounds about 9-1-1 is crucial to the effectiveness of our emergency response system. It is especially important for vulnerable populations like children, the deaf and the hard of hearing, and those with limited English skills to understand and use.

A National 9-1-1 Education Month will encourage the development of public awareness events, advertising to the public, targeted outreach to schools, and training activities for parents and teachers. The deaf and hard of hearing are increasingly using text, video and instant messaging to access 9-1-1 operators. With such an effective and comprehensive emergency network, everyone benefits from learning.

As co-chairs of the E9-1-1 Caucus, Mr. SHIMKUS and I understand the importance of the 9-1-1 emergency network to the public safety and security of our country and this resolution will help to ensure that all Americans can access these critical services in an emergency. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a National 9-1-1 Education Month.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 537, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1430

E. ARTHUR GRAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3196) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, as the "E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. E. ARTHUR GRAY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, shall be known and designated as the "E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I stand with my colleagues from the Empire State of New York in consideration of H.R. 3196, which renames a postal facility in Port Jervis, New York, in honor of E. Arthur Gray, former mayor and statesman from Orange County, New York. H.R. 3196 enjoys the support of the entire congressional delegation from New York, and was introduced by my colleague Representative John Hall back on July 26, 2007. The measure was taken up by the Oversight Committee on February 26, 2008, and was passed by a voice vote.

H.R. 3196 calls for honoring E. Arthur Gray's service to his community, State, and therefore his country by designating the post office in his hometown of Port Jervis, New York, as the E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building.

E. Arthur Gray was Port Jervis's longest serving mayor, completing 5½ terms from 1978 to 1988. After his tenure as mayor, in 1988 Gray became a New York State senator by ousting a 16-year incumbent. Gray represented New York's 39th District during his time in the New York legislature.

A native and lifelong resident of Port Jervis, Gray began his professional career as cofounder and director of Gray-Parker Funeral Home in Port Jervis, New York, before entering the realm of public service and politics. Well-known throughout Orange County, New York, for his stellar high school basketball days at Port Jervis High School and as a World War II veteran, Gray gave unselfishly of himself by serving as the chairman of the Port Jervis Community Development Agency, a member of the Orange County Economic Development Agency and as chairman of the National League of Small Cities Advisory Council.

Madam Speaker, in honor of E. Arthur Gray's public service and compassionate spirit, let us pass without reservation H.R. 3196 and rename the postal facility on Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, after this great American citizen.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, as the E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building.

A native of Port Jervis, Arthur Gray spent a lifetime serving his community, State, and country. He was well-known in the community, first as a high school basketball star, then as a veteran of the Second World War who later became a local funeral home director.

Mr. Gray accomplished a lot by the time he was elected to his first term as mayor of Port Jervis in 1978. Described as generous and always willing to lend a helping hand, Mayor Gray was the longest serving mayor in the history of Port Jervis, maintaining his position for five and a half terms until 1988, when he was elected to represent the 34th District in the New York State Senate.

His commitment to the community extended far beyond his office doors. He was a former member and chairman of the Port Jervis Community Development Agency, a former member of the Orange County Economic Development Agency, former chairman of the National League of Small Cities Advisory Council, and participated in numerous local boards and organizations.

Sadly, Arthur Gray died on April 10, 2007, at the age of 82. A loving husband, father of two, grandfather, and truly dedicated public servant, Arthur Gray exemplified civic duty and social responsibility. His contributions to his community and beyond will not soon be forgotten, and I urge that we accept this bill memorializing the tremendous life of this man.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3196.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STEVE W. ALLEE CARRIER ANNEX

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4166) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the "Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4166

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STEVE W. ALLEE CARRIER ANNEX.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the honorable gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the author of this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding and giving me this opportunity.

It goes without saying that the United States Postal Service has an historic reputation for excellence and unyielding dedication to the people of our Nation. "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these carriers from the swift completion of

their appointed rounds" are the words engraved on the outside of the James A. Farley Post Office Building in New York City. Every day, thousands of postal employees proudly wear the uniform of the United States Postal Service with the understanding of the enormity of this commitment.

Today, Madam Speaker, I stand before the House in support of H.R. 4166, a bill I introduced to pay tribute to the life of one of those public servants, Mr. Steven W. Allee of Stoutland, Missouri, and a rural mail carrier for the citizens of Lebanon, Missouri.

Since 1989, Mr. Steve Allee held a full-time position as a rural carrier at the Lebanon, Missouri, Post Office. He was a dedicated employee, a loving family man to his wife Debbie, his children and his grandchildren, a member of the Buffalo Prairie Baptist Church, and a friend to many.

Tragically, Madam Speaker, on August 20, 2007, Mr. Allee was killed in the line of duty when his vehicle was swept away by floodwaters in rural Lebanon. This flash flood was unprecedented in its magnitude. As Mr. Allee completed his route, he approached a country bridge under which a typically dry creekbed usually lies. However, on this day, the rapidly falling rainwater had overtaken the bridge. When Mr. Allee attempted to cross, his vehicle was swept away.

Today, I urge the House of Representatives to honor this man for his public service and his commitment to his community. Let us pay our respects to his personal and postal family by designating the facility, the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In his hometown of Lebanon, Missouri, Steve Allee was known not just as a rural postal carrier at the Lebanon Post Office, but also as a dear friend and loving family man. He came from a family of letter carriers. His father was a highway contract driver, and his cousin is the postmaster in Stoutland, Missouri.

Mr. Allee was a dedicated post office employee for over 15 years until the tragic loss of his life while on the job on August 20, 2007. On that tragic day, Mr. Allee was going about his daily routine of delivering mail until a torrential rainstorm began. He was attempting to cross a bridge over what is normally a dry creekbed, but due to the rainfall, the creek had become flooded. Mr. Allee perished as his vehicle was washed away in the rush of water. This serves as an example of how public servants in the course of their everyday duties are sometimes thrust into dangerous and, in this case, deadly circumstances.

We acknowledge Mr. Allee's service and his sacrifice. He will be deeply missed by all the people's lives that he touched.

With this, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this fitting tribute to a dedicated postal employee who lost his life in the line of duty.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues from the great State of Missouri in the consideration of H.R. 4166, which names the postal facility in Lebanon, Missouri, after Steve W. Allee, a dedicated and long-serving United States postal worker.

H.R. 4166, which was introduced by Representative IKE SKELTON of Missouri on November 13, 2007, was considered and reported from the Oversight Committee on February 26, 2008, by a voice vote. The measure has the support of the entire congressional delegation from Missouri and provides us with yet another opportunity to pay tribute to an American citizen whose life was taken while simply performing his professional duties of delivering the mail.

The story of Mr. Allee's tragic death begins on Monday, August 20, 2007, where, according to a Missouri State Highway Patrol report, at 2 p.m. in Laclede County, 10 miles east of Lebanon, Missouri, a 2003 Chevy Blazer driven by Steve Allee, 51, of Stoutland, Missouri, came upon a flooded roadway and was swept away as a result of flooding on the Missouri River.

□ 1445

Allee, who was on duty during the accident, was found 2 miles downstream and pronounced dead at the scene.

At the urging of Representative SKELTON, passage of H.R. 4166 will allow Congress to make in order a small tribute to this big-hearted individual, a United States postal carrier himself. Mr. Allee had been delivering mail since 1989, when he succumbed to his death as a result of the Missouri River overrunning its banks last fall.

Let us also remember and express our gratitude for the life of this dedicated postal worker, who was tragically taken from us by a force of nature while performing his vocation of delivering the mail, by passing H.R. 4166.

I want to thank Representative IKE SKELTON for moving to honor this gentleman for the work that he not only did but for the life that he gave.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4166.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FOR 150 YEARS OF LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 924) congratulating Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of leadership and service to the United States and the world as Iowa's land-grant university, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 924

Whereas Iowa State University of Science and Technology was established by the Iowa General Assembly on March 22, 1858, as the Iowa Agricultural College and Model Farm in response to the State of Iowa's desire to provide higher education opportunities to farm families and working classes in Iowa, predating the passage of the Federal Morrill Act by 4 years;

Whereas on September 11, 1862, Iowa became the first State in the United States to accept the terms and conditions of the Morrill Act creating the land-grant system of colleges and universities;

Whereas the Iowa Agricultural College and Model Farm, known today as Iowa State University of Science and Technology, received Iowa's land-grant charter on March 29, 1864, making it one of the first land-grant institutions in the United States;

Whereas Iowa State University was a pioneer in all 3 parts of the land-grant mission, including—

- (1) allowing access to all, regardless of race, gender, or social class;
- (2) practical research; and
- (3) outreach;

Whereas Iowa State University fulfilled the 3 parts of the land-grant mission by—

- (1) creating the first land-grant institution to be coeducational from its opening, with 16 women in its first class; future suffragist Carrie Chapman Catt was an 1880 graduate; and George Washington Carver was the first African-American student, earning a bachelor's degree in 1894 and a master's degree in 1896, and was also the institution's first African-American faculty member;

- (2) establishing the United States' first Engineering Experiment Station and domestic economy experimental kitchen, and one of the first agriculture experiment stations; and

- (3) organizing the Farmers Institutes in the winter of 1869, by Iowa State President Adonijah Welch, and organizing the nation's first county Extension Service in 1903 in Sioux County in northwest Iowa by Professor Perry Holden;

Whereas some of the most important technological advancements of the modern world were the result of research at Iowa State, including—

- (1) development of hybrid seed corn in the 1920s;
- (2) pioneering work on soybean oil extraction and producing ethanol from corn and other plant materials by Professor Orland Sweeney in the 1930s;
- (3) invention of the electronic digital computer in the late 1930s by Professor John

Atanasoff and graduate student Clifford Berry, whose Atanasoff-Berry Computer was the first to incorporate the 7 basic principles of modern computing;

- (4) laying the foundation for the modern plastics industry with polyethylene research by Professor Henry Gilman;

- (5) development of the process still used today to refine pure rare-earth materials, including reactor-grade uranium, by Professor Frank Spedding and Harley Wilhelm, as a result of Iowa State's key role in the Manhattan Project in WWII;

- (6) development of modern livestock animal genetics by Professor Jay Lush; and

- (7) first field-testing of a genetically altered plant (tobacco) in 1987 and genetically altered tree (poplar) in 1989 by Professor Robert Thornburg;

Whereas Iowa State hired one of the first permanent campus artists-in-residence, with sculptor Christian Petersen holding that position from 1934 to 1955 and providing hundreds of sculptures and other art objects to the university, whose Art on Campus collection today includes more than 600 major public works of art;

Whereas Iowa State has had a technology transfer office since 1935, longer than all but one other university in the United States, and is acknowledged today as a leader in putting technology to work, being cited as a "model of economic development" and "licensing powerhouse" in a 2007 study commissioned by the National Science Foundation;

Whereas Iowa State University is today spearheading new advances in science and technology, including new materials, information sciences, green architecture, biological research, and the development of bio-renewable fuels and other resources to support the bioeconomy and the Nation's independence from nonrenewable petroleum resources; and

Whereas more than 257,000 degrees have been awarded by Iowa State, and its graduates include heads of State, leaders of industry, great humanitarians, and gifted scientists, whose work has improved the quality of life for people worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives congratulates Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of outstanding service to the State of Iowa, the United States, and the world in fulfilling its mission as a land-grant university; and thanks the State of Iowa for its visionary leadership in the beginning of the land-grant movement in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMANN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 924 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LOEBSACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I am proud to speak today in strong support of House Resolution 924, congratulating Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of leadership and service to the United States and the world as Iowa's land-grant university.

Iowa State University is not in the Second District, but it is a very important place to me. The university serves thousands of students across Iowa, helping them prepare for the workforce and starting them on the path to success. Iowa State is my alma mater. I received a first-rate education at the university; and although I now represent the University of Iowa Hawkeyes, I am proud to be a Cyclone.

Iowa State has many claims to fame. It was the first land-grant institution to be coeducational from its opening, with 16 women in its first class.

Future suffragette Carrie Chapman Catt was an 1880 graduate. George Washington Carver was the first African-American student, earning a bachelor's degree in 1894 and a master's degree in 1896 and was also the institution's first African-American faculty member.

Iowa State is also known for its cutting-edge agricultural research. Agriculture is a driving force in our State's economy, and the work the university does helps us remain competitive and strong. I am proud to say that most undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at Iowa State come from Iowa, and a large proportion of these students remain in Iowa.

In fact, about 71 percent of College of Agriculture and Life Science graduates stay in Iowa for their first jobs. Young men and women graduate and gain employment on farms and agricultural services, in forestry, in fishing, and much more.

I congratulate Iowa State University for 150 years of excellence, and I look forward to another 150 years of the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMANN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 924, congratulating Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of leadership and service to the United States and the world as Iowa's land-grant university.

Iowa Agriculture College and Model Farm, now Iowa State University, was officially established on March 22, 1858. As a land-grant institution, Iowa agriculture college focused on ideals that higher education should be accessible to all and that the university should teach liberal and practical subjects. These ideas are integral to the land-grant university policy.

Even before Abraham Lincoln signed a law that gave birth to the land-grant universities, Iowa State was actively bringing knowledge to the people of

Iowa through farmers' short courses and farm demonstrations. The first official class, consisting of 24 men and two women, entered at Ames in 1869 and graduated in 1872.

Iowa State then was a leader and is now a leader in agriculture, engineering, extension, home economics, and created the Nation's first State veterinary medicine school in 1879. In 1959, the college was officially renamed Iowa State University of Science and Technology. The focus on technology has led to many research patents and inventions, including the first binary computer, the round hay baler, and many, many more.

Today Iowa State University has approximately 27,000 students, some change from over 100 years ago. With world-class programs in agriculture, technology, science and art, the "U.S. News & World Report" ranks Iowa State among the top 50 public national universities. Half of Iowa State University freshmen get an early boost in academic success by participating in Iowa State's highly touted Learning Communities Program. Additionally, Iowa State University is ranked 18th in the Nation for its study or work abroad programs.

Iowa State University is a very special place that is full of history; but what truly makes it unique is a rare combination of campus beauty, the opportunity to be part of the land-grant experiment, and to create a progressive and inventive spirit that they call the Cyclone Experience.

I extend my congratulations along with all my colleagues to the university president, Gregory Geoffroy, all of Iowa State University's faculty, its staff, certainly, its students and alumni, and wish them continued success.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOESACK. First I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his wonderful words for Iowa State University.

Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my friend and mentor, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 924, celebrating the 150th anniversary of Iowa State University.

I want to thank my dear friend, Congressman LOESACK, for his leadership and yielding the time, and I also want to thank Congressman BRALEY and Congressman LATHAM for their leadership on this resolution.

Iowa State University has made noteworthy contributions to the State of Iowa, our Nation and the world since being established in 1858. Iowa State was the first co-ed land-grant institution providing opportunities for students regardless of gender, race, or social class. Iowa State is home to critical agriculture research, from the development of the hybrid seed corn in the 1920s to important work on the de-

velopment of ethanol and to the development of modern livestock animal genetics and many more.

Iowa State continues to lead the Nation in research into biorenewable fuels and modern agriculture. In 2005 Iowa State's students finished third in the North American Solar Challenge, the world's longest solar car race. Iowa State has excelled in a number of other areas, from development of the electronic digital computer in the 1930s to research into refining reactor-grade uranium.

The campus of Iowa State is also noteworthy. With over 600 public works of art, Iowa State was rated one of the 25 most beautiful campuses in "The Campus as a Work of Art." Iowa State has graduated a number of prominent contributors to our Nation, including, as mentioned, George Washington Carver, who went on to serve as the school's first African American faculty member, as well as suffragette Carrie Chapman Catt, who graduated in 1880.

In fact, more than half my colleagues in the current Iowa delegation attended Iowa State, including Mr. LOESACK, who is the floor manager of the bill, BRUCE BRALEY, TOM LATHAM, and Senator TOM HARKIN.

I look forward to continuing to work with the great institution that is Iowa State University and I am confident that Iowa State will continue to have great influence in Iowa and across our Nation. Again, congratulations to Iowa State University for 150 remarkable years.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, Iowa State University is one of the most respected land-grant universities in the Nation. Created by the Iowa General Assembly in 1858, the Iowa Agricultural College and Model Farm was designated the first land-grant college when Iowa became the first state to accept the terms of the Federal Morrill Act in 1864.

The act allowed Iowa to sell Federal land to finance a new college open to all, regardless of wealth, race or sex; offering a practical education in engineering, agriculture, and military science as well as classical studies; and sharing research knowledge with all Iowans. Iowa State University officially opened in 1869 and was the first coeducational land-grant school. Today, we are proudly celebrating the 150th anniversary of Iowa State University.

Iowa State University has been a leader in science in technology throughout its long history. The world's first electronic digital computer was developed at Iowa State by math and physics professor John V. Atanasoff and graduate student Clifford Berry, in the late 1930s. Their invention, the ABC computer, has been called the most important technological innovation of the 20th century.

The university is a leader in virtual reality research and its most advanced virtual reality theater, the C6, is the Nation's first six-sided theater that totally immerses the user in images and sound.

Iowa State is one of the top three U.S. universities in the development of patentable biotechnology. Last February, the Iowa Board of Regents approved a \$32 million budget and

conceptual design for a new biorenewables research laboratory at Iowa State University. The laboratory is the first piece of a new biorenewables complex planned for the university.

Biorenewables research is the future of ISU and the State of Iowa. I congratulate Iowa State University on 150 years, and wish them many more. Go Cyclones.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alumnus, Iowa State University, for 150 years of service to Iowa and the Nation. Iowa State University was founded on March 22, 1858, as the Iowa Agricultural College and Model Farm. The college was one of the first land grant institutions in the country and was founded in response to the state of Iowa's strong desire to provide higher education opportunities to farm families and the working class in Iowa.

I'm proud to say that my alma mater has taken an active role in promoting social justice and racial equality throughout its 150 year history. Iowa State University was the first coeducational land grant university graduating 16 women in its first graduating class. George Washington Carver was the first African American to graduate from the college in 1880 and later served as a faculty member at Iowa State. Women suffragist Carrie Chapman Catt also graduated from Iowa State in 1880. Finally, Iowa State is home to the only division one football stadium to be named for an African American. Jack Trice stadium is named for Iowa State football player Jack Trice. Trice died due to injuries suffered during an Iowa State football game in 1923.

Some of the biggest technological advancements in the world of science were made at Iowa State University. In the late 1930's Professor John Atanasoff and graduate student Clifford Berry invented the first electronic digital computer at Iowa State. In the 1920's hybrid seed corn was developed at Iowa State and in the 1930's Professor Orland Sweeny conducted pioneer work on ethanol production from corn. Finally, the school established the Nation's first engineering experiment station and domestic economy experimental kitchen, and one of the first agricultural experiment stations.

I'm proud to call Iowa State my alma mater and congratulate them for 150 years of academic excellence. I urge my colleagues to join with me in congratulating the Iowa State community for all they have done and will continue to do for Iowa and the nation.

Mr. KUHLE of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOESACK. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOESACK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 924, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KUHLE of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2008 FEDEX ORANGE BOWL

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 948) congratulating the University of Kansas ("KU") football team for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and having the most successful year in program history, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 948

Whereas on January 3, 2008, the University of Kansas (KU) football team won the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl, defeating Virginia Tech by a score of 24 to 21 for the first major bowl victory in university history;

Whereas the KU football team won 12 games this season to set a school record;

Whereas KU ranked seventh in the final Top 25 polls released on January 8, 2008, for the second highest final ranking in school history (the school ranked sixth in 1968);

Whereas the KU football team reached a number 2 ranking on November 18, 2007, their highest national ranking in program history;

Whereas the KU team set the school record for points, an average of 42.77 points per game, and total yards (479.77 yards);

Whereas KU was the only school in the country to rank in the top 5 nationally in both scoring offense (second) and scoring defense (fifth);

Whereas Head Coach Mark Mangino was awarded multiple national coach of the year honors;

Whereas Head Coach Mark Mangino has produced a minimum of 6 wins in 3 straight seasons for the first time in 46 years for the KU football program;

Whereas the KU football team produced 2 first-team All-Americans, cornerback Aqib Talib and offensive tackle Anthony Collins, and 1 second-team All-American in defensive tackle James McClinton; and

Whereas the KU football team was also honored to have 2 Academic All-America recipients on the team, Russell Brorsen and John Larson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates and commends the University of Kansas football team for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and for having the most successful year in program history;

(2) recognizes the significant achievements of the players, coaches, students, alumni, and support staff whose dedication and hard work helped the University of Kansas football team win the FedEx Orange Bowl; and

(3) respectfully requests the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the following individuals for display:

(A) Robert Hemenway, Chancellor of the University of Kansas.

(B) Richard Lariviere, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor of the University of Kansas.

(C) Lew Perkins, Athletics Director of the University of Kansas.

(D) Mark Mangino, Head Coach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 948 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LOEBSACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the University of Kansas for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and having the most successful year in the program's history.

On January 3, 2008, Kansas captured its first major bowl victory in university history by defeating Virginia Tech. College football fans, student athletes, and the Nation were treated to an exceptional college bowl game.

I want to extend my congratulations to head coach Mark Mangino, athletic director Lou Perkins, University of Kansas Chancellor Robert Hemenway, and Kansas's student athletes for winning the Orange Bowl and obtaining a school record 12-1 season.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the Virginia Tech Hokies and their student athletes for a great season.

Winning the Orange Bowl and finishing the season with a 12-1 record has brought positive national attention to Kansas, and I know the fans of the university will cherish this moment as they look forward to the 2008 season. Student athletes balance a rigorous school workload with the many practices and games in which they compete. I am proud of student athletes for their dedication to their schoolwork and their sport.

Madam Speaker, once again I congratulate the University of Kansas for their success, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. KUHLM of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I noticed that the gentleman from Iowa was a little quizzical and hesitant in congratulating a fellow Big 12 team from Kansas. But in any case, Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 948 congratulating the University of Kansas football team, affectionately known as KU, for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and having the most successful year in program history.

On January 3, 2008, the University of Kansas football team won the 2008

FedEx Orange Bowl defeating Virginia Tech by a score of 24-20 for its first major bowl victory in university history.

The KU football team won a school record 12 games this past season and ended the season ranked seventh in the final top 25 polls released on January 8, 2008. This is the second highest final ranking in school history.

This past year's KU team set the school record with points per game, with an average of 42 points per game, and total yards per game, with an average of 479 yards. KU is the only school in the country to rank in the top five nationally in both scoring offense, which was second, and scoring defense, in which they were fifth.

Following the remarkable year, head coach Mark Mangino was awarded multiple national Coach of the Year awards. And, in fact, Coach Mangino has produced a minimum of six wins in three straight seasons, for the first time in 46 years for the KU football program.

The KU football team also produced two first team All Americans, cornerback Aqib Talib and offensive tackle Anthony Collins. Equally important, the team produced two academic All American recipients, Russell Brorsen and John Larson.

In addition to successful athletic programs, KU also provides faculty, academic and research programs of international distinction, and outstanding libraries, teaching museums, and teaching technology. These resources enrich the undergraduate experience and are essential for graduate-level education and for research.

From early existence, the University of Kansas has been fueled by high aspirations and has enjoyed a national reputation for innovation and academic excellence. I extend my congratulations to head coach Mark Mangino, all of the hardworking players, the fans, and to the University of Kansas. I am happy to join my friend and colleague in honoring this exceptional team for all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), also the distinguished Chair of the Armed Services Committee on which I serve.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me take this opportunity to congratulate the gentlelady from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) for paying tribute to the Kansas University football program. It is impressive.

But I would yield to the gentleman from Iowa if he would answer a few questions.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Yes, I will.

Mr. SKELTON. I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to ask you if you know of the outcome of the

Missouri University Tigers football team when they played the Kansas Jayhawks on November 24, 2007.

Mr. LOEBSACK. No.

Mr. SKELTON. Would you be interested in knowing that the Missouri Tigers defeated the Kansas Jayhawks 36-28 on November 24, 2007?

Mr. LOEBSACK. Yes.

Mr. SKELTON. And would you also be interested in knowing that the Missouri Tigers finished fourth on the national Associated Press poll to Kansas' number 7 on the Associated Press poll?

Mr. LOEBSACK. Yes.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank you.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SKELTON for his comments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 948, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING THE WOMEN'S WATER POLO TEAM OF UCLA FOR WINNING THE 2007 NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 493) congratulating the women's water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship, and congratulating UCLA on its 100th NCAA sports national title, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 493

Whereas on May 13, 2007, the women's water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), defeated Stanford 5-4 in the championship game of the NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship tournament;

Whereas the victory gave Head Coach Adam Krikorian and the Bruins women's water polo team their third consecutive NCAA Championship and was the team's fifth overall national title;

Whereas Kelly Rulon, a driver for the Bruins, was selected as the tournament's Most Valuable Player;

Whereas UCLA women's water polo players Kelly Rulon, Emily Feher, Courtney Mathewson, Jillian Kraus, and Kacy Kunkel were named to the NCAA All-Tournament First Team;

Whereas the UCLA women's water polo team finished the 2007 season with a record of 28 wins and 2 losses, and now has a record of 90 wins and 6 losses over the past 3 seasons;

Whereas the 2007 Women's Water Polo National Championship makes UCLA the first school ever to win 100 NCAA sports national titles;

Whereas UCLA won its 100th NCAA title less than 58 years after the UCLA men's tennis team won the school's first NCAA title in 1950;

Whereas 16 different men's and women's sports programs contributed to the Bruins' 100 NCAA national championships, including—

(1) men's basketball in 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, and 1995;

(2) men's golf in 1988;

(3) women's golf in 1991 and 2004;

(4) men's gymnastics in 1984 and 1987;

(5) women's gymnastics in 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003, and 2004;

(6) men's soccer in 1985, 1990, 1997, and 2002;

(7) women's softball in 1982, 1984, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1999, 2003, and 2004;

(8) men's swimming in 1982;

(9) men's tennis in 1950, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1956, 1960, 1961, 1965, 1970, 1971, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1982, 1984, and 2005;

(10) men's track and field in 1956, 1966, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1978, 1987, and 1988;

(11) women's outdoor track and field in 1982, 1983, and 2004;

(12) women's indoor track and field in 2000 and 2001;

(13) men's volleyball in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1987, 1989, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2006;

(14) women's volleyball in 1984, 1990, and 1991;

(15) men's water polo in 1969, 1971, 1972, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2000, and 2004; and

(16) women's water polo in 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2007;

Whereas UCLA teams have won 14 NCAA national championships during the tenure of Daniel G. Guerrero, the current Director of Athletics at UCLA; and

Whereas UCLA, under the leadership of Chancellor Gene Block, continues to establish itself as one of the top research universities as well as top athletic programs in the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the women's water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, and Head Coach Adam Krikorian for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship;

(2) congratulates UCLA on becoming the first school to win 100 NCAA sports national championship titles, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history; and

(3) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, students, alumni, and staff of UCLA who were instrumental over the years in this prestigious achievement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which

Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 493 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LOEBSACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of California, Los Angeles, on its 100th NCAA team championship. On May 13, 2007, the women's water polo team, led by head coach Adam Krikorian, defeated Stanford 9-4 in the last round of the Women's Water Polo National Championship tournament, thereby making the University of California, Los Angeles, the first team in history to win 100 NCAA team championships.

This was the team's third consecutive NCAA championship and its fifth overall national title. Team member Kelly Rulon was selected as the tournament's Most Valuable Player, and Ms. Rulon and four of her teammates, Emily Feher, Courtney Mathewson, Jillian Kraus, and Kacy Kunkel, were named to the NCAA all-tournament team.

UCLA won its first national title in men's tennis in 1950. Since then, 16 different athletics programs, nine men's programs and seven women's, have won national championships in the sports of basketball, golf, gymnastics, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, track and field, volleyball, and, of course, water polo. In the last 5 years alone, under the leadership of director of athletics Dan Guerrero, UCLA teams have won 14 NCAA national championships in nine different sports.

This extraordinary achievement is a tribute to the skill and dedication of the many players, coaches, students, alumni, families, professors, staff, and fans who have helped to make UCLA an athletic powerhouse as well as an academic force.

Madam Speaker, I express my support for H. Res. 493 and urge my colleagues to pass this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 493 as well. But there is a person in the Chamber who is a little closer than the gentleman from Iowa or myself from New York, and so I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague's courtesy. Almost all that I was going to say about UCLA's prowess in athletics has already been stated for the RECORD.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, many a person looking at the wondrous world of athletics oftentimes thinks only of the 11 banners that involves John Wooden's era as coach of UCLA's basketball team. As has been suggested, one would really miss the point of the fabulous work done at the UCLA campus, way beyond athletics, in academics, et cetera. But indeed, the women's water polo team set the standard by winning the 100th championship when they won one more time. It is a fabulous item to be associated with UCLA and to get this recognition from so many great friends.

In the meantime, I want you all to know that my dog Bruin very much appreciates the attention.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the UCLA Bruins for being the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history, having won 100 NCAA championships.

Many observers might presume that for UCLA the only game in town is men's basketball. Many walk into Pauley Pavilion and see 11 championship banners, experience the legacy of John Wooden, and presume that's all there is. But for UCLA, that is only the beginning.

The UCLA men's tennis team won the first NCAA championship for the Bruins in 1950 and the last 58 years have been witness to an unprecedented record of success. Including the 11 men's basketball titles, UCLA's championship record extends across 16 different programs including multiple titles in men's volleyball, 19; men's tennis, 16; women's softball, 10; men's track and field, 8; men's water polo, 8; women's gymnastics, 5; women's track and field, 5; and women's water polo, 5.

UCLA's 100th championship came from the women's water polo team, which won its third consecutive NCAA Division I championship on May 13, 2007. The Bruins, coached by Adam Krikorian, finished 28–2 and have been 90–6 over the past three seasons. Courtney Mathewson scored three goals and Jillian Kraus added two more as the Bruins beat rival Stanford. Kelly Rulon was selected as the tournament's Most Valuable Player. Rulon, Mathewson, and Kraus were joined by Emily Feher and Kacy Kunkel as members to the NCAA All-Tournament First Team.

These championships reflect the philosophies of great Bruin coaches like basketball icon John Wooden and volleyball legend Al Scates. Their commitment to hard work, discipline, and sportsmanship has created a legacy of victory unparalleled in college sports. Additionally, the contributions of all the fans, students, alumni, and staff have been instrumental over the years in helping UCLA achieve 100 championships.

The list of Bruin athletes who contributed to the school's heritage of victory is a rollcall of the greatest athletes of our time: Lewis Alcindor, Arthur Ashe, Evelyn Ashford, Jimmy Connors, Gale Devers, Mitch Gaylord, Florence Griffith-Joyner, Jackie Joyner-Kersey, Karch Kiraly, Jackie Robinson, Bill Walton, and others.

I'm especially proud that UCLA is a public university committed to diversity and fulfilling the promise of Title IX. Since 1982, Bruin women teams have contributed 30 championships to UCLA's total. This is enough to put them 11th on the NCAA's all-time champions list.

One hundred championships is a reflection of the teamwork that is the hallmark of UCLA athletics and its strong tradition of combining excellence in athletics with excellence in academics. UCLA's commitment to hard work, discipline, and sportsmanship has created a tradition of victory unparalleled in college sports.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Iowa and California in support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 493—Congratulating the women's water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship, and congratulating UCLA on its 100th NCAA sports national title, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history.

On May 13, 2007, the UCLA women's water polo team defeated Stanford 5–4 in the championship game of the NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship tournament.

The victory gave head coach Adam Krikorian and the Bruins women's water polo team their third consecutive NCAA championship and was the team's fifth overall national title.

Kelly Rulon, a driver for the Bruins, was selected as the tournament's most valuable player; and Emily Feher, Courtney Mathewson, Jillian Kraus, and Kacy Kunkel were named to the NCAA All-Tournament First Team.

The UCLA women's water polo team finished the 2007 season with a record of 28 wins and 2 losses and now has a record of 90 wins and 6 losses over the past 3 seasons.

This national title makes UCLA the first school ever to win 100 NCAA sports national titles—only 58 years after the UCLA men's tennis team won the school's first NCAA title in 1950. Along the way, 16 different men's and women's sports programs contributed to the Bruins' 100 NCAA national championships.

UCLA teams have won 14 NCAA national championships during the tenure of Daniel G. Guerrero, the current director of athletics. Under the leadership of Chancellor Gene Block, UCLA continues to establish itself as one of the top research universities as well as top athletic programs in the Nation.

I extend my congratulations to Chancellor Block, Athletics Director Guerrero, Head Coach Adam Krikorian and his staff, all of the hard-working players, the fans, and to UCLA. I am happy to join my good friend and colleague Representative LEWIS in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise today to congratulate the University of California, Los Angeles—My alma mater—on its 100th NCAA team championship.

In a Nation with so many colleges and universities known for their strong sports programs, heck, in a city the size of Los Angeles with sports powerhouse USC right across town, this is a truly amazing accomplishment.

At UCLA, which has so many firsts in other areas, the 2007 UCLA women's water polo Team helped UCLA reach another first: the first to 100 NCAA team championships.

On May 13, 2007, the women's water polo team, led by Head Coach Adam Krikorian, de-

feated Stanford 9–4 in the last round of the Women's Water Polo National Championship tournament, thereby making history.

This was the team's third consecutive NCAA championship and its fifth overall national title. Team member Kelly Rulon was selected as the tournament's Most Valuable Player, and Ms. Rulon and four of her teammates—Emily Feher, Courtney Mathewson, Jillian Kraus, and Kacy Kunkel—were named to the NCAA all-tournament team.

UCLA won its first national title in men's tennis in 1950. Since then, 16 different athletics programs—nine men's programs and seven women's—have won national championships in the sports of basketball, golf, gymnastics, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, track and field, volleyball, and, of course, water polo.

In the last 5 years alone, under the leadership of Athletic Director Dan Guerrero, UCLA athletics teams have won 14 NCAA national championships in nine different sports.

This extraordinary achievement is a tribute to the skill and dedication of the many players, coaches, students, alumni, families, professors, staff, and fans who have helped to make UCLA an athletic powerhouse as well as one of the top academic universities in the Nation.

UCLA's accomplishment also demonstrates the success of Title IX. Of the 100 NCAA championships that UCLA teams have earned, women's teams have been responsible for 30. And the NCAA didn't even begin awarding championships in women's sports until the 1981–82 season.

To all the athletes of UCLA, past and present, male and female, you rock.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 493, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1834

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Ms. LEE) at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 537, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3196, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4166, by the yeas and nays.

Votes on House Resolutions 924, 948 and 493 will be taken later this week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL 9-1-1 EDUCATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 537, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 537, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—381

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abercrombie | Buchanan | Delahunt |
| Ackerman | Burgess | DeLauro |
| Aderholt | Burton (IN) | Dent |
| Akin | Butterfield | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Alexander | Camp (MI) | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Allen | Campbell (CA) | Dicks |
| Altmire | Cannon | Dingell |
| Andrews | Cantor | Doggett |
| Arcuri | Capito | Donnelly |
| Baca | Capps | Doyle |
| Bachmann | Capuano | Drake |
| Bachus | Cardoza | Dreier |
| Baird | Carnahan | Duncan |
| Baldwin | Carney | Edwards |
| Barrett (SC) | Carter | Ehlers |
| Barrow | Castle | Ellison |
| Bartlett (MD) | Castor | Ellsworth |
| Barton (TX) | Chabot | Emanuel |
| Bean | Chandler | Emerson |
| Becerra | Clarke | Engel |
| Berkley | Clay | English (PA) |
| Berman | Cleaver | Eshoo |
| Biggart | Clyburn | Etheridge |
| Bilbray | Coble | Everett |
| Bilirakis | Cole (OK) | Fallin |
| Bishop (GA) | Conaway | Farr |
| Bishop (NY) | Conyers | Fattah |
| Bishop (UT) | Costa | Feeney |
| Blackburn | Courtney | Ferguson |
| Blumenauer | Cramer | Filner |
| Blunt | Crenshaw | Flake |
| Boehner | Crowley | Forbes |
| Bono Mack | Culberson | Fortenberry |
| Boozman | Cummings | Fossella |
| Boswell | Davis (AL) | Fox |
| Boucher | Davis (CA) | Frank (MA) |
| Boustany | Davis (IL) | Franks (AZ) |
| Boyd (FL) | Davis (KY) | Frelinghuysen |
| Boyd (KS) | Davis, David | Gallegly |
| Brady (PA) | Davis, Lincoln | Garrett (NJ) |
| Brady (TX) | Deal (GA) | Gerlach |
| Braley (IA) | DeFazio | Giffords |
| Broun (GA) | DeGette | Gillibrand |
| Brown (SC) | | Gingrey |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Gohmert | Lungren, Daniel | Roybal-Allard |
| Gonzalez | E. | Royce |
| Goode | Mack | Ruppersberger |
| Goodlatte | Mahoney (FL) | Ryan (OH) |
| Gordon | Maloney (NY) | Ryan (WI) |
| Granger | Manzullo | Salazar |
| Graves | Markey | Sali |
| Green, Al | Marshall | Sanchez, Linda |
| Green, Gene | Matheson | T. |
| Grijalva | Matsui | Sarbanes |
| Gutierrez | McCarthy (CA) | Saxton |
| Hall (NY) | McCarthy (NY) | Schakowsky |
| Hall (TX) | McCaul (TX) | Schiff |
| Hare | McCollum (MN) | Schmidt |
| Harman | McCotter | Schwartz |
| Hastings (FL) | McDermott | Scott (GA) |
| Hastings (WA) | McGovern | Scott (VA) |
| Hayes | McHenry | Sensenbrenner |
| Heller | McHugh | Serrano |
| Hensarling | McIntyre | Sessions |
| Herger | McKeon | Sestak |
| Herseth Sandlin | McMorris | Shadeegg |
| Higgins | Rodgers | Shays |
| Hill | McNerney | Shea-Porter |
| Hinchey | McNulty | Sherman |
| Hinojosa | Meek (FL) | Shimkus |
| Hirono | Meeks (NY) | Shuler |
| Hobson | Melancon | Shuster |
| Hodes | Mica | Simpson |
| Hoekstra | Michaud | Sires |
| Holden | Miller (FL) | Skelton |
| Holt | Miller (NC) | Slaughter |
| Honda | Miller, Gary | Smith (NE) |
| Hoyer | Miller, George | Smith (NJ) |
| Hunter | Mollohan | Smith (TX) |
| Inglis (SC) | Moore (KS) | Smith (WA) |
| Inslee | Moore (WI) | Snyder |
| Israel | Moran (KS) | Solis |
| Issa | Murphy (CT) | Souder |
| Jackson (IL) | Murphy, Patrick | Space |
| Jackson-Lee | Murphy, Tim | Spratt |
| (TX) | Murtha | Stark |
| Johnson (GA) | Musgrave | Stearns |
| Johnson (IL) | Myrick | Stupak |
| Johnson, E. B. | Nadler | Sutton |
| Johnson, Sam | Napolitano | Tancredo |
| Jones (NC) | Neugebauer | Tanner |
| Jones (OH) | Nunes | Tauscher |
| Jordan | Obey | Terry |
| Kagen | Olver | Thompson (CA) |
| Kanjorski | Ortiz | Thornberry |
| Kaptur | Pallone | Tiahrt |
| Keller | Pascarell | Tiberi |
| Kennedy | Pastor | Tierney |
| Kildee | Paul | Towns |
| Kind | Payne | Tsongas |
| King (IA) | Pearce | Turner |
| King (NY) | Perlmutter | Udall (NM) |
| Kingston | Peterson (MN) | Upton |
| Kirk | Petri | Van Hollen |
| Klein (FL) | Pickering | Velázquez |
| Kline (MN) | Pitts | Visclosky |
| Knollenberg | Platts | Walberg |
| Kucinich | Poe | Walden (OR) |
| Kuhl (NY) | Pomeroy | Walz (MN) |
| LaHood | Porter | Wamp |
| Lamborn | Price (GA) | Wasserman |
| Lampson | Price (NC) | Schultz |
| Larsen (WA) | Putnam | Watson |
| Larson (CT) | Radanovich | Watt |
| Latnam | Rahall | Waxman |
| LaTourette | Ramstad | Weiner |
| Latta | Regula | Bishop (GA) |
| Lee | Rehberg | Bishop (NY) |
| Levin | Reichert | Bishop (UT) |
| Lewis (CA) | Renzi | Westmoreland |
| Lewis (GA) | Reyes | Whitfield (KY) |
| Lewis (KY) | Reynolds | Wilson (OH) |
| Linder | Richardson | Wilson (SC) |
| Lipinski | Rogers (AL) | Wittman (VA) |
| LoBiondo | Rogers (KY) | Wolf |
| Loeb sack | Rogers (MI) | Wu |
| Lofgren, Zoe | Roskam | Wynn |
| Lowey | Ross | Yarmuth |
| Lucas | Rothman | Young (AK) |

NOT VOTING—47

| | |
|------------|---------------|
| Davis, Tom | Mitchell |
| Doolittle | Moran (VA) |
| Gilchrist | Neal (MA) |
| Hooley | Oberstar |
| Hulshof | Pence |
| Jefferson | Peterson (PA) |
| Kilpatrick | Pryce (OH) |
| Langevin | Rangel |
| Cohen | Rodriguez |
| Costello | Rohrabacher |
| Cubin | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cuellar | Miller (MI) |
| | Rush |

| | | |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sanchez, Loretta | Udall (CO) | Wexler |
| Sullivan | Walsh (NY) | Wilson (NM) |
| Taylor | Waters | Woolsey |
| Thompson (MS) | Weldon (FL) | Young (FL) |

□ 1859

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. ARTHUR GRAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3196, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3196.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—382

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abercrombie | Cantor | Ellison |
| Ackerman | Capito | Ellsworth |
| Aderholt | Capps | Emanuel |
| Akin | Capuano | Engel |
| Alexander | Cardoza | English (PA) |
| Allen | Carnahan | Eshoo |
| Altmire | Carney | Etheridge |
| Andrews | Carter | Everett |
| Arcuri | Castle | Fallin |
| Baca | Castor | Farr |
| Bachmann | Chabot | Fattah |
| Bachus | Chandler | Feeney |
| Baird | Clarke | Ferguson |
| Baldwin | Clay | Filner |
| Barrett (SC) | Cleaver | Flake |
| Barrow | Clyburn | Forbes |
| Bartlett (MD) | Coble | Fortenberry |
| Barton (TX) | Cole (OK) | Fossella |
| Bean | Conaway | Fox |
| Becerra | Conyers | Frank (MA) |
| Berkley | Cooper | Franks (AZ) |
| Berman | Costa | Frelinghuysen |
| Biggart | Courtney | Gallegly |
| Bilbray | Cramer | Garrett (NJ) |
| Bilirakis | Crenshaw | Gerlach |
| Bishop (GA) | Crowley | Giffords |
| Bishop (NY) | Culberson | Gillibrand |
| Bishop (UT) | Cummings | Gingrey |
| Blackburn | Davis (AL) | Gohmert |
| Blumenauer | Davis (CA) | Gonzalez |
| Blunt | Davis (IL) | Goode |
| Boehner | Davis (KY) | Goodlatte |
| Bono Mack | Davis, David | Gordon |
| Boozman | Davis, Lincoln | Granger |
| Boren | Deal (GA) | Graves |
| Boswell | DeFazio | Green, Al |
| Boucher | DeGette | Green, Gene |
| Boustany | Grijalva | Grijalva |
| Boyd (FL) | DeLauro | Gutierrez |
| Boyd (KS) | Dent | Hall (NY) |
| Brady (PA) | Diaz-Balart, L. | Hall (TX) |
| Brady (TX) | Diaz-Balart, M. | Hare |
| Braley (IA) | Dicks | Harman |
| Broun (GA) | Dingell | Hastings (FL) |
| Brown (SC) | Doggett | Hastings (WA) |
| Buchanan | Donnelly | Hayes |
| Burgess | Doyle | Heller |
| Burton (IN) | Drake | Hensarling |
| Butterfield | Dreier | Herger |
| Camp (MI) | Duncan | Herseth Sandlin |
| Campbell (CA) | Edwards | Higgins |
| Cannon | Ehlers | Hill |

Hinchey McDermott
Hinojosa McGovern
Hirono McHenry
Hobson McHugh
Hodes McIntyre
Hoekstra McKeon
Holden McMorris
Holt Rodgers
Honda McNerney
Hoyer McNulty
Hunter Meek (FL)
Inglis (SC) Meeks (NY)
Inslee Melancon
Israel Mica
Issa Michaud
Jackson (IL) Miller (FL)
Jackson-Lee Miller (NC)
(TX) Miller, Gary
Johnson (GA) Miller, George
Johnson (IL) Mollohan
Johnson, E. B. Moore (KS)
Johnson, Sam Moore (WI)
Jones (NC) Moran (KS)
Jones (OH) Murphy (CT)
Jordan Murphy, Patrick
Kagen Murphy, Tim
Kanjorski Murtha
Kaptur Musgrave
Keller Myrick
Kennedy Nadler
Kildee Napolitano
Kind Neugebauer
King (IA) Nunes
King (NY) Obey
Kingston Oliver
Kirk Ortiz
Klein (FL) Pallone
Kline (MN) Pascrell
Knollenberg Pastor
Kucinich Paul
Kuhl (NY) Payne
LaHood Pearce
Lamborn Perlmutter
Lampson Peterson (MN)
Langevin Petri
Larsen (WA) Pickering
Larson (CT) Pitts
Latham Platts
LaTourette Poe
Latta Pomeroy
Lee Porter
Levin Price (GA)
Lewis (CA) Price (NC)
Lewis (GA) Putnam
Lewis (KY) Radanovich
Linder Rahall
Lipinski Ramstad
LoBiondo Regula
Loeb sack Rehberg
Lofgren, Zoe Reichert
Lowey Renzi
Lucas Reyes
Lungren, Daniel Reynolds
E. Richardson
Mack Rogers (AL)
Mahoney (FL) Rogers (KY)
Maloney (NY) Rogers (MI)
Manzullo Roskam
Markey Ross
Marshall Rothman
Matheson Roybal-Allard
Matsui Royce
McCarthy (CA) Rumpersberger
McCarthy (NY) Ryan (OH)
McCaul (TX) Ryan (WI)
McCollum (MN) Salazar
McCotter Sali

NOT VOTING—46

Berry Hulshof
Bonner Jefferson
Brown, Corrine Kilpatrick
Brown-Waite, Ginny Lychant
Buyer McCrery
Calvert Miller (MI)
Cohen Mitchell
Costello Moran (VA)
Cubin Neal (MA)
Cuellar Oberstar
Davis, Tom Pence
Doolittle Peterson (PA)
Emerson Pryce (OH)
Gilchrist Rangel
Hooley Rodriguez

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1909

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVE W. ALLEE CARRIER ANNEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4166, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4166.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—382

Abercrombie Cardoza
Ackerman Carnahan
Aderholt Carney
Akin Carter
Alexander Castle
Allen Castor
Altmire Chabot
Andrews Chandler
Arcuri Clarke
Baca Clay
Bachmann Cleaver
Bachus Clyburn
Baird Coble
Baldwin Cole (OK)
Barrett (SC) Conway
Barrow Conyers
Bartlett (MD) Cooper
Barton (TX) Costa
Bean Courtney
Becerra Cramer
Berkley Crenshaw
Berman Crowley
Biggart Culberson
Billray Cummings
Bilirakis Davis (AL)
Bishop (GA) Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY) Davis (IL)
Bishop (UT) Davis (KY)
Blackburn Davis, David
Blumenauer Davis, Lincoln
Blunt Deal (GA)
Boehner DeFazio
Bono Mack DeGette
Boozman Delahunt
Boren DeLauro
Boswell Dent
Boucher Diaz-Balart, L.
Boustany Diaz-Balart, M.
Boyd (FL) Dicks
Boyd (KS) Dingell
Brady (PA) Doggett
Brady (TX) Donnelly
Braley (IA) Doyle
Broun (GA) Drake
Brown (SC) Dreier
Buchanan Duncan
Burgess Edwards
Burton (IN) Ehlers
Butterfield Ellison
Camp (MI) Ellsworth
Campbell (CA) Emanuel
Cannon Emerson
Cantor Engel
Capito English (PA)
Capps Eshoo
Capuano Etheridge

Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rumpersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—46

Berry Hulshof
Bonner Jefferson
Brown, Corrine Kilpatrick
Brown-Waite, Ginny Lynch
Buyer Marchant
Calvert McCrery
Cohen Miller (MI)
Costello Mitchell
Cubin Moran (VA)
Cuellar Murtha
Davis, Tom Neal (MA)
Doolittle Oberstar
Emerson Pence
Gilchrist Peterson (PA)
Hooley Pryce (OH)
Rangel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1918

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 108, 109, and 110 I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, due to official business in the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, I was unable to attend several votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H. Res. 537, Expressing support for the designation and goals of "National 9-1-1 Education Month," "yea" on final passage of H.R. 3196, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, as the "E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building," and "yea" on final passage of H.R. 4166, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the "Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I was absent today from three rollcall votes due to family obligations in Arizona that required my attention.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H. Res. 537, rollcall vote No. 108; H.R. 3196, rollcall vote No. 109; and H.R. 4166, rollcall vote No. 110.

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on House Administration from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 306, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object, but I will not object.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important resolution. It's something we do every year, and I can't imagine any more appropriate use of the rotunda of the Capitol than to recognize and commemorate the days of the Holocaust and the victims of the Holocaust. It's something that we do every year, something we should do every year and

perhaps more frequently. And it is extremely important for us to recognize this as we confront genocide in other parts of the world, to recognize the genocide that started all genocides and started the discussions about the horrible nature of genocide. So I'm very strongly in favor of this.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 306

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

The Rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on May 1, 2008, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY TO HONOR THE 5 YEARS OF SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF OUR TROOPS AND THEIR FAMILIES IN THE WAR IN IRAQ AND TO REMEMBER THOSE WHO ARE SERVING OUR NATION IN AFGHANISTAN AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I send a concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 313, to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object, but I will not object. I simply want to point out this is a very important thing that we should do for our troops. I'm delighted that someone has suggested that we use the rotunda for this purpose.

We all know how difficult it has been for the troops in both Afghanistan and Iraq and in other parts of the world. We also know that there is not universal support in our country for the work that they are doing, and this makes their job doubly difficult. So I'm very pleased to support this resolution and make certain that we truly and properly honor the work of our Armed Forces and their families throughout the world when they work in such difficult circumstances.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. Yes, I would be delighted to yield.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I would just note that, as the gentleman has mentioned, it is important that we honor the 5 years of service and sacrifice of our troops and their families in the war in Iraq and remember our troops serving in Afghanistan and throughout the world.

I would note that Ranking Member EHLERS is a cosponsor of this resolution, and both conflicts are still ongoing. Our troops' efforts have gone above and beyond the call of duty. Their sacrifice and dedication to their country must be honored, as well as the sacrifice and dedication of American troops stationed at home and around the world. And I am pleased that we will have this important recognition in the people's House, in the rotunda.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EHLERS. Reserving the right to object, I simply want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her good comments. And I hope every Member of this Congress will join us in approving this particular resolution.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 313

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY HONORING THOSE SERVING IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ.

(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on March 13, 2008, for a ceremony to honor the 5 years of service and sacrifice of our troops and their families in the war in Iraq and to remember those who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan and throughout the world.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the ceremony referred to in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the two concurrent resolutions just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN STEVE KING REGARDING SENATOR BARACK OBAMA

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly condemn the remarks made about U.S. Senator and Democratic Presidential Candidate BARACK OBAMA by Congressman STEVE KING of Iowa, who said that if BARACK OBAMA became President, al Qaeda terrorists would, and I quote, "be dancing in the streets in greater numbers than they did on September 11." Why? Because, he said, "of his middle name and because of who his father was."

Senator OBAMA, like all of us in this House, swore on the Bible to defend our country from all enemies, foreign and domestic. He has done nothing to warrant this attack. He has served his country honorably in the U.S. Senate. This attack on his patriotism, religion, heritage, and middle name amount to nothing more than a smear campaign.

I would fully expect these comments to come from people like Rush Limbaugh or Ann Coulter, not from one of my House colleagues. There is simply no room in this country for remarks like these, remarks that Mr. KING declares he stands by.

I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning these hateful remarks.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

H.R. 3196, NAMING THE PORT JERVIS POST OFFICE THE E. ARTHUR GRAY POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, just moments ago, this body voted to pay an appropriate tribute to a dedicated public servant in New York's 19th Congressional District.

On April 10, 2007, the Hudson Valley lost one of its most involved leaders when E. Arthur Gray, a former five-term mayor of Port Jervis and New York State Senator, passed away at the age of 82 years old. He left behind a legacy of friendship, involvement and service that earned him a permanent place in the heart of Port Jervis and serves as an example of what it means to work for the betterment of your community.

By voting to pass legislation that would redesignate the post office in Port Jervis, New York, as the E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building, the House has acknowledged the contributions of an individual who loved his hometown and who, as a businessman, government official and family man, dedicated a significant portion of his time and energy to its civic life.

Simply put, Arthur Gray was a Port Jervis resident to the core: born February 28, 1925, in Port Jervis, a grad-

uate of Port Jervis High School before leaving briefly for college, only to return as president and co-owner of the Gray-Parker Funeral Home in his native Port Jervis.

Art Gray's participation in public life extended to government service. He was mayor of Port Jervis from 1978 to 1988. A lifetime resident of Port Jervis, Gray gave his undivided attention to issues, both large and small, and was widely known for his open-door policy.

Art Gray remains the longest-serving mayor in the history of Port Jervis. During his tenure he was able to reinvigorate the downtown area and greatly improve the city's economic development plan. Citizens of the local area remember Art as a man who was generous in nature and willing to help those in need. After finishing his service as mayor, Art Gray maintained his commitment to public service by successfully running for a seat in the New York State senate in 1988.

He represented the 39th Senatorial District in that capacity until 1990. But E. Arthur Gray's contributions to his city and his country were not limited to business and politics. He served as a lieutenant in the U.S. Naval Reserve during World War II. He was also deeply involved in community life, and the list of organizations that count him as a member is astounding.

At one time or another, Art Gray was a member of the Port Jervis Community Development Agency, the Orange County Economic Development Agency, the National League of Small Cities Advisory Council, St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Bon Secours Community Hospital Advisory Board, Knights of Columbus Council No. 471, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Elks Lodge No. 645, BPOE, Port Jervis Lions Club, Tri-States Chamber of Commerce, Port Jervis Country Club, Metaque Falls Hunting Club, Tri-States Rod and Gun Club, the Port Jervis Board of Education, and Port Jervis Planning Board.

When you look at that list, you gain a true appreciation for how much time, energy, and dedication Art Gray devoted to betterment of his hometown. However, he devoted just as much, if not more, to his family and friends. He was extremely devoted to his wife, Helen; son, Gerald; daughter, Brigid; and numerous other family members and close friends. He is remembered by those closest to him as enthusiastic, optimistic, supporting, loving, and inspirational.

Through it all, E. Arthur Gray's life was deeply interwoven with the fabric of Port Jervis, his home, and it is fitting that the adoption of this bill will help memorialize his service.

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand with yet another sunset memorial. It is March 10, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sunset today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent American lives that were lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,831 days since the travesty called Roe v. Wade was handed down by an arrogant Supreme Court. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of our own children.

Some of them, Madam Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over their vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common: They were each just little babies that had done nothing wrong to anyone; each one of them died a nameless and lonely death; and each of their mothers, whether she realizes it immediately or not, will never be the same; and all the gifts these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet, even in the full glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invisible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims to date, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's important for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves again of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the only chief and only object of good government."

The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here. It is our sworn oath.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our core commitment to this self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the whole world. It is who we are.

And yet, Madam Speaker, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibilities as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection that we should have given them.

It seems so sad, Madam Speaker, that this sunset memorial may be the only public remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this Chamber. So, as small a gesture as it might be, I would respectfully ask this moment for a moment of silence for those lost little Americans.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who hears this sunset memorial tonight will finally realize that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that 12,831 days killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered, and that all too soon, each of us will walk through these Chambers for the very last time. And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene at yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of the innocent unborn. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and constitutional duty to protect the least of these, our tiny American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is March 10, 2008, Madam Speaker, 12,831 days since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children. This, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

JOBS POST BIGGEST DROP IN 5 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, since 2000, our Nation has lost over 3,400,000 more manufacturing jobs. In fact, the job creation record of the Bush administration is the worst since the Hoover administration.

The figures released by the U.S. Department of Labor last week posted the largest job loss in 5 years. The report was much weaker than expected, and, strangely, the unemployment rate declined because there were fewer people in the workforce. CNN's Moneyline re-

ported that employers made their deepest cuts in staffing in almost 5 years in February. There was a net loss of 63,000 more jobs, which is the biggest decline since March 2003, and weaker than the revised 22,000 job loss reported for January. The job loss was widespread, reaching beyond the battered construction industry, which lost 39,000 jobs, and manufacturing, where job losses hit 52,000.

Retailers cut 34,000 jobs while business and professional service cut 20,000 jobs. Temporary staffing firms cut nearly 28,000 jobs off their payrolls, another warning sign of employers pulling back, and hotels cut about 4,000 jobs, a sign that discretionary consumer spending could be on the wane. Overall, the private sector cut over 101,000 jobs according to the CNN Moneyline report.

The widening recession in almost every sector, not just the goods-producing sector, is extraordinarily important. I wish to place those numbers in the RECORD and say, Madam Speaker, America needs to create more real wealth here at home and stop borrowing prosperity and piling on more debt. We need to create jobs leading to energy independence in this country. We need to do more than just sort of flash our hand at that and be serious about it.

We need new transportation systems in our country. We need new bridges in the ground. We need people to be employed, those who now are idle labor, in helping to build back our economy from coast to coast.

A real stimulus package would lead our Nation to invest here at home, not just to borrow more from abroad. These numbers are serious omens. They're warning signs to those who have responsibility here in Washington to do more than manipulate interest rates. They would engage this Congress in an effort to build forward again in those sectors that would leave future generations real wealth, the kind of wealth that our ancestors left us: libraries, schools, highways, bridges, new energy systems, clean water systems, new transportation systems, new high-speed rail, new air control towers; the kind of wealth that can't be outsourced that belongs to the American people for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I place in the RECORD the figures from the CNN Moneyline report about what happened with the biggest job loss in 5 years in this past quarter.

JOBS POST BIGGEST DROP IN 5 YEARS

(By Chris Isidore)

NEW YORK.—Employers made their deepest cut in staffing in almost five years in February, according to a closely watched government report Friday that showed the labor market far weaker than expected, fueling already building recession fears.

There was a net loss of 63,000 jobs, according to the Labor Department, which is the biggest decline since March 2003 and weaker than the revised 22,000 job loss reported for January. Economists surveyed by Briefing.com had forecast a gain of 25,000 jobs in the most recent reading.

The job loss was widespread, reaching beyond the battered construction sector, which lost 39,000 and manufacturing, where job losses hit 52,000. Retailers cut 34,000 jobs, while business and professional services cut 20,000 jobs.

Temporary staffing firms cut nearly 28,000 jobs off their payrolls, another warning sign of employers pulling back, and hotels cut about 4,000 jobs, a sign that discretionary consumer spending could be on the wane.

Overall the private sector cut 101,000 jobs, with only a gain in government employment limiting losses.

Despite the job loss, the unemployment improved to 4.8% from the 4.9% reading in January. Economists had forecast the unemployment rate would rise to 5%. The rate fell because of a big jump in the number of people that the government counted as no longer in the labor force.

The labor market has weakened significantly in recent months, prompting fears of recession along with a \$170 billion economic stimulus package and a series of interest rate cuts from the Federal Reserve.

The Fed is next set to meet March 18 to consider what to do with interest rates. Friday's report would seem to suggest more rate cuts are on the way, despite the improved unemployment rate.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL WAR POWERS RESOLUTION OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, this Thursday, March 13, 2008, the International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight Subcommittee will conduct a hearing on "War Powers for the 21st Century: The Congressional Perspective." I would like to thank Chairman BILL DELAHUNT and Ranking Member DANA ROHRBACHER for scheduling this hearing. It is my understanding that Chairman DELAHUNT and Ranking Member ROHRBACHER also plan to hold two additional war powers hearings during the month of April.

I am extremely grateful for their interest in this very important issue. Along with former Congressmen David Skaggs and Mickey Edwards, who are cochairmen of the Constitutional Projects War Powers Initiative, this Thursday I will testify on the legislation I introduced in October of 2007, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, H.J. Res. 53.

Too many times this Congress has abdicated its constitutional duty by allowing Presidents to overstep their executive authority. Our Constitution states that while the Commander-in-Chief has the power to conduct wars, only Congress has the power to authorize war.

It is for this reason that in 1999 I joined 16 of my colleagues in Congress to file a suit against President Clinton for unconstitutionally conducting offensive military attacks against Yugoslavia without obtaining a declaration of war or other explicit authorizations from Congress.

Now, as threats to international peace and security continue to evolve, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, H.J. Res. 53, rededicates Congress to its primary constitutional role of deciding when to use force abroad.

In 1793, James Madison said, “. . . The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature . . . the executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war.”

The Framers of our Constitution sought to decentralize the war powers of the United States and construct a balance between the political branches.

□ 1945

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 aimed to clarify the intent of the constitutional Framers and to ensure that Congress and the President share in the decision-making process in the event of armed conflict. Yet, since the enactment of the resolution, time and again Presidents have maintained that the resolution's consultation, reporting, and congressional authorization requirements are unconstitutional obstacles to executive authority.

By more fully clarifying the war powers of the President and the Congress, the legislation I've introduced, H.J. Res. 53, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, improves upon the War Powers Resolution of 1973 in a number of ways. It clearly spells out the powers that the Congress and the President must exercise collectively, as well as the defensive measures the Commander in Chief may exercise without congressional approval. It also provides a more robust reporting requirement that would enable Congress to be more informed and to have greater oversight. And it protects and preserves the checks and balances the Framers intended in the decision to bring our Nation into war.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to congressional hearings on this critical issue. The time for Congress to meet its constitutional duty is long overdue.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask God to continue to bless our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to ask God to continue to bless the families of our men and women in uniform.

ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as the two Democratic contenders duke it out in the Presidential campaign, there's one issue that they both seem very eager to be identified with. And it's very unfortunate, it's the issue of economic isolationism. This kind of policy is as dangerous as it is inconsistent with their own rhetoric.

Both Democratic contenders like to talk about the need to enhance our Na-

tion's image and increase our leadership in the international community. They talk about diplomacy and soft power, and then they turn around and insist we try to withdraw from the worldwide marketplace and cede our global economic leadership. It has even been suggested by them that we go back on a 14-year deal with our two closest neighbors, including our neighbor to the north who has been such a key political ally.

Perhaps this outlandish rhetoric is delivered with a wink and a nod. Perhaps it's merely an attempt to score a few political points without any intention to actually dismantle the deep economic and political ties that we share with our trading partners in this hemisphere. Frankly, I hope that that is the case. But either way, Madam Speaker, this is very dangerous rhetoric.

NAFTA has long been addressed by those running for office as though it were an unmitigated disaster; no one seems to want to touch it with a 10-foot pole. After all, everyone knows that NAFTA has hurt our economy and cost us millions of jobs. Right? Wrong. In 1994, when Bill Clinton sent NAFTA to the Congress, the gross domestic product in this country was \$6.9 trillion. Today, we have a \$14.1 trillion economy. In other words, we have more than doubled the size of our economy in the NAFTA-era. When adjusted for inflation, the numbers are still very striking, with 50 percent growth since 1994. During the same period, 25 million jobs have been created, while our labor force has grown by 18 million.

Fourteen years of NAFTA have seen our economy grow considerably while more Americans are working than ever before and new jobs have abounded. To put it bluntly, anyone who says that NAFTA has destroyed our economy is flat out wrong. Not only has the predicted “giant sucking sound” that we heard about during the NAFTA debate not come to pass, but the precise opposite has taken place.

But, Madam Speaker, NAFTA is just one component of the complex relationships that entail our global engagement, where the economic and the political are inextricably entwined, and nowhere is this role more critical than in our own neighborhood. We have spent years and countless resources promoting democracy in this hemisphere. The rise of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and his cohorts throughout the region have demonstrated that authoritarianism in our backyard is still a reality. As he sends troops to the border he shares with our friend and ally, Colombia, we are reminded that tyranny in our hemisphere still poses very grave threats.

NAFTA, CAFTA, the Peru Free Trade Agreement, and the proposed agreements with Colombia and Panama build upon the twin pillars of liberty: democratic governments and free markets. They enhance our economic strength with new opportunities and

give us greater leverage to ensure that we have peaceful and prosperous neighbors. And we know that peace and prosperity, Madam Speaker, go hand in hand.

We simply cannot disengage economically without disengaging politically. Engagement through trade is our source of strength and our leadership, and we would disengage to our peril. Those who regard our leadership in the international community so casually that they would trash it for political gain threaten not only our own prosperity, but our ability to play a positive role in this hemisphere and around the globe as we seek to grow our economies and to grow the economies of our neighbors.

U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, to urge the Speaker of this House to bring the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement to this House floor for a vote.

And let me tell you this: this agreement is good for the State that I represent. It's good for Colombia. It's good for the United States. It's good for Illinois farmers. It's good for Illinois workers. And it's good for Illinois manufacturing.

And I would note that in my district I have 8,000 Caterpillar workers, union Caterpillar workers who are manufacturing workers. And under this agreement, I note under the U.S.-Colombia Trade Agreement that our machinery exports see their tariffs imposed on Illinois-made construction equipment eliminated on day one. Now, you think about it, mining equipment used in Colombia is \$1 million equipment, that's a \$100,000 tax on U.S.-made products eliminated on day one.

Currently, Illinois exports \$214 million to Colombia, and that's just the beginning. According to the International Trade Commission, Illinois is a big winner. Pork products will increase 72 percent, according to their economic analysis. Corn and soybeans will see increased sales to Colombia. Fabricated metal products, processed foods, and chemicals will all see increases. And, again, it's expected that machinery, manufactured machinery, like products made by John Deere and Navistar and Caterpillar, will increase 15 percent.

Agriculture. The leaders of agriculture will tell you the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement is the best for agriculture in the history of all trade negotiations. And let's not forget that 80 percent of U.S. exports are currently taxed when they enter Colombia, and they will become duty free immediately. That will allow us to

become competitive with China and Asia and other competition.

We know Colombia, a democracy, as a reliable partner and ally. We know that Colombia is the oldest democracy in Latin America. And we also recognize that President Uribe of Colombia is our hemisphere's most popular elected official with over 80 percent approval ratings. Compare that to this Congress, which has a 15 percent approval rating. Big difference.

Now, there are those who oppose the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. They say that Colombia, amongst all the good things it's done, just hasn't done enough regarding violence against labor leaders. Let's remember that Colombia has had 40 years of civil strife driven by left-wing guerrillas trying to overthrow the democratically elected government of Colombia. But today, 71 percent of Colombians say they feel more secure under President Uribe; 73 percent say Uribe respects human rights. Those are Colombians, not Americans, saying that.

Homicides are down 40 percent in Colombia; kidnappings are down 76 percent. The murder rate today in Medellin, once the poster child of violence in Colombia, one of the most dangerous cities on the planet, today has a lower murder rate than Washington, DC, or Baltimore.

But let's look at the facts on labor violence. President Uribe has made major changes, beginning with reforming the judiciary. He has had hired 418 new prosecutors, 545 new investigators. In fact, in the Prosecutor General's Office, responsible for targeting those who are responsible for the violence in Colombia, they've added over 2,000 new posts.

Funding has gone up 75 percent in the last few years alone under President Uribe. And quoting Carlos Rodriguez, president of the United Workers Confederation, a labor leader in Colombia: "Never in the history of Colombia have we achieved something so important." Again, that's a Colombian labor leader.

President Uribe and Colombia, under the government initiatives, have worked to protect labor leaders, giving them special protections. Last year, they spent over \$38 million for body guard protection for labor union leaders; 1,500 union members and activists received special protection, the second largest protected group in Colombia, and it's been successful. For labor activists under this program, none have lost their lives. And I would note that the murder rate today for labor unionists is lower than the national murder rate for everyone else.

So progress has been made.

And I would note that crimes categorized as anti-union violence often are not union related, but regular crime that everyone in Colombia has contended with, many are the responsibility of the leftist FARC.

I would note that the International Labor Organization has removed Colombia from its labor watch list. Co-

lombia has agreed to a permanent ILO representative in Colombia. And perhaps most telling, 14 Colombian labor leaders have given their support to the trade agreement.

The bottom line is, ladies and gentlemen, this agreement is good for Illinois workers, it's good for Illinois manufacturers, it's good for Illinois farmers. Let's bring it up for a vote. I ask my colleagues to support this important trade agreement. And I will also include for the RECORD a copy of an "Economist" article talking about President Hugo Chavez and the FARC and their opposition to this agreement.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2008.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Please read this informative recent article from The Economist about FARC narcoterrorists in Colombia and troubling links with the Chavez administration in Venezuela. As noted below, "Mr. Chavez, still with oil money but politically on the defensive, may have thrown in his lot with an outlaw army of drug-traffickers."

Now more than ever we must support the pending Trade Promotion Agreement with our neighbor and friend Colombia.

Sincerely,

JERRY WELLER,
Member of Congress.

(From The Economist, Mar. 6, 2008)

COLOMBIA IS MOVING CLOSER TO BREAKING THE FARC—UNLESS VENEZUELA STOPS IT

On few, if any, other occasions has a head of state issued detailed orders for military mobilization as jauntily as if he were ordering pizza, and on live television. That is what Hugo Chavez, Venezuela's president, did on March 2nd, after Colombian forces bombed a camp just inside Ecuador, killing Raul Reyes, a senior commander of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) guerrillas.

"Minister of defence!" bellowed Mr. Chavez, on "ALó PRESIDENTE" ("Hello President"), his weekly radio and television programme. "Send me ten battalions to the border, including tanks." He also ordered the forward deployment of his new Russian fighter-bombers, threatening that if Colombia's president, Alvaro Uribe, tried a similar raid on Venezuelan soil he would "send over the Sukhois". The next day he broke diplomatic ties with Colombia.

Venezuelan troops and tanks duly moved to the more populated points of the long border between the two countries. Customs officials halted Colombian trucks at the busiest crossing point, between Cucuta and San Cristobal.

What made this performance odd was that it was Ecuador, not Venezuela, whose sovereignty had been violated. True, Colombia has often accused Venezuela of harbouring guerrilla leaders and tolerating camps near the border similar to the one bombed in Ecuador. But did Venezuela's president have a guilty conscience?

"Maybe he knew what was coming," wrote Teodoro Petkoff, a guerrilla leader in the 1960s who now edits an opposition newspaper in Caracas. Mr. Chavez's apparent over-reaction was a pre-emptive attempt to "throw a veil over the revelations he suspected might come from Raul Reyes' computer," suggested Mr. Petkoff.

With Ecuador's president, Rafael Correa, following Mr. Chavez's lead, this week's events sent Latin America's diplomats scurrying to prevent war enveloping the neighbourhood. But they also laid bare that Colombia's government is coming close to

breaking the back of the FARC, and in the process threatening to shine light on its murky relations with neighbouring governments.

When Mr. Uribe took office in 2002, the guerrillas were rampant. His predecessor had just halted peace negotiations because the FARC had used a "demilitarised" zone created to host the talks as a base for recruitment and for kidnapping (many of the politicians it has held hostage were seized during the talks). The guerrillas had some 17,000 troops; they blocked main roads and bombarded small towns, kidnapping and killing almost at will. To make matters worse, the state's inability to provide security had spawned murderous right-wing paramilitary groups.

Mr. Uribe's "democratic security" policy has achieved a dramatic change. By expanding the security forces, he has driven the FARC from populated areas, while persuading most of the paramilitaries to demobilize. Officials reckon they have reduced the FARC's ranks to fewer than 11,000. But the guerrillas withdrew to the vast tropical lowlands, to areas they have controlled for 40 years. There they resisted a two-year offensive by 18,000 troops. The army could not get near the FARC's seven-man governing secretariat, of which Mr. Reyes (the NOM DE GUERRE of Luis Edgar Devia) was a member.

SEEKING THE SECRETARIAT

Thwarted, the security forces refined their strategy. They put more effort into seeking the FARC's leaders using information from guerrilla deserters and infiltrators, and from sophisticated bugging equipment provided by the United States. Over the past year, this has started to pay off. Two FARC regional commanders have been killed and one captured. In January and February alone, the army claims to have killed 247 guerrillas and captured 226, with another 360 deserting. This pressure has pushed FARC units to the borders with Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama.

Last month the government received a tip-off that Mr. Reyes was in a camp less than two kilometers (1.25 miles) inside Ecuador. Mr. Uribe authorized a bombing raid by Brazilian-made Super Tucano aircraft, which killed at least 21 guerrillas. Colombian troops then crossed the border to recover Mr. Reyes's corpse—and his laptop computers. (They left three wounded women guerrillas unattended.)

Most Colombians were jubilant that the government had struck at the very top of the FARC at last. Mr. Reyes handled the guerrillas' relations with the outside world; he was one of three deputies to Manuel Marulanda, the FARC's elderly leader. For the first time the security forces have shown that they are capable of infiltrating and defeating the guerrillas' tough systematic strikes, said Roman Ortiz of Fundacion Ideas para la Paz, a Bogota think-tank.

Mr. Uribe doubtless thought that Mr. Correa could be mollified over the cross-border raid. But spurred on by Mr. Chavez, Ecuador's president sent 3,200 troops to the border and cut diplomatic ties. He demanded an emergency meeting of the Organization of American States (OAS) to condemn Colombia, and set off on a tour of regional capitals seeking support.

THE LAPTOP LODGE

Almost as important as the killing of Mr. Reyes may be the capture of his laptops. Apart from inside information on the FARC, according to Colombian officials, they contain documents which—if true—are embarrassing to Mr. Correa but highly damaging to Mr. Chavez. As the FARC's top negotiator,

Mr. Reyes appears to have met representatives of many governments. According to one e-mail, he met Gustavo Larrea, Mr. Correa's security minister last month. Mr. Larrea is alleged to have proposed a formal meeting in Quito to discuss securing the border and negotiating the release of some of the FARC's 700-odd hostages. Mr. Larrea said that Colombian officials knew of his meeting, which was purely to talk about the hostages.

Ecuadorian officials having swapped complaints with their Colombian counterparts about their mutual inability to prevent the FARC from crossing the border. Ecuador claims to spend \$160m a year containing the spillover. It is also angry about Colombia spraying coca fields on the border with weed-killer, which it says drifts south on to other crops.

Nevertheless, Ecuador has given some help to Colombia. Mr. Correa claimed that last year his forces dismantled 47 FARC camps inside Ecuador and on three occasions carried out joint operations with Colombian troops. American surveillance aircraft still patrol over Colombia from an air base in Ecuador, although Mr. Correa has promised not to renew the lease for this when it expires in 2009.

By contrast, Mr. Chavez has recently been unambiguous in his support for the FARC. He fell out with Mr. Uribe last year over his attempt to act as a mediator for the hostages. Since then he has cast aside his previous stance as an honest broker seeking a peaceful solution to Colombia's internal conflict. When the FARC turned over two hostages to him in January, Mr. Chavez hailed the guerrillas as a "true army" whose status as belligerents should be recognised. No other government in the region, not even Cuba's, echoed this call. On "ALO PRESIDENTE" Mr. Chavez held a minute's silence in honor of Mr. Reyes, whom he said he had met three times over the years. He declared that Colombia needed to be "liberated" from its "subservience" to the United States.

Another document allegedly on Mr. Reyes's computer showed that Mr. Chavez paid (or planned to pay) the FARC \$300m. An (unrelated) e-mail to Mr. Reyes suggested that the FARC were trying to obtain uranium for a "dirty bomb". All this prompted some far-fetched exchanges. Mr. Uribe said that he would denounce Mr. Chavez for "financing genocide"; in return, Venezuela accused Colombia's police chief, who revealed the contents of Mr. Reyes's laptop, of being a "drug trafficker".

"This is * * * a microphone war," said General Raul Salazar, a former defense minister. Like many other Venezuelans, he doubts that it will become a real one. That is not least because many army officers do not want war with Colombia and find Mr. Chavez's actions an "embarrassment", said another former defense minister, General Raul Baduel, who is now a prominent opponent of the president.

So what is Mr. Chavez's game? One possible answer is his obsessive search for an external enemy to shore up his waning popularity at home. In December, his political blueprint for a socialist Venezuela, with indefinite presidential re-election, was defeated in a referendum. This came only a year after he won a second six-year term with 63 percent of the vote, and was the first time he had lost a national vote.

In November Venezuelans are due to vote for mayors and state governors. They are increasingly discontented about crime, an inflation rate that has surged to 25 percent and shortages of basic goods, including food and cooking gas. Because of Mr. Chavez's mismanagement of agriculture, Venezuela imports much of its food from Colombia. Any

lasting interruption of trade would hurt both countries. Reputable pollsters say that Mr. Chavez's popularity has fallen well below 50 percent. Visible faction fights have broken out in his newly formed Unified Socialist Party of Venezuela.

Picking a fight with Colombia and supporting the FARC are unlikely to win him friends. One poll, by Hinterlaces, showed 89 percent opposed to a war and 87 percent opposed to the FARC. So the reason for his military mobilization may be to deter Colombia from moving against the FARC camps in Venezuela where some Colombian officials believe that Mr. Marulanda is based. A more worrying, though improbable, hypothesis is that Mr. Chavez, a former army officer, is throwing off all pretence at being a civilian democrat and, fearing that he may not remain in power for long, wants to launch an assault on what he sees as American imperialism and its regional stooge, Mr. Uribe.

Although George Bush gave public support to Mr. Uribe, other governments in the region, led by Brazil, tried to drive a wedge between Mr. Correa and Mr. Chavez. There were signs that this might work. On March 5th Ecuador agreed to an OAS resolution criticizing, but not formally condemning, Colombia. The OAS also agreed to investigate the bombing. Once the region's diplomats have patched things up between these two countries, they face another, more intractable problem: Mr. Chavez, still with oil money but politically on the defensive, may have thrown in his lot with an outlaw army of drug-traffickers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS MESSAGE HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members would have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it's befitting that you are in the Speaker's chair today as we discuss this very important hour.

I have the pleasure to manage this hour on behalf of the Congressional

Black Caucus. And we're going to be talking about black history and women's history, a combination of last month and this month's themes.

I want to begin by saying that we will have an opportunity to discuss the state of black women in America and pay tribute to African American women in our communities. We felt it befitting, as we recently celebrated Black History Month in February and currently are in the midst of Women's History Month.

Tonight we will begin by highlighting some of the findings from the recent study of "The State of Black America," released by the Urban League, and discussing some of the wonderful women from our own congressional districts.

I would like to begin now by yielding time to my colleague and good friend from the great State of California, DIANE WATSON.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker and my honorable colleague, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, thank you for this opportunity to salute our women over a period of time.

I would like now to introduce you to a woman by the name of Mayme Clayton.

Mayme Clayton, a renowned librarian, worked her entire life to assemble a priceless collection of historical artifacts. The collection was assembled over a 40-year period by Mayme A. Clayton, 1923 to 2006, a career librarian at the University of Southern California in my district, and University of California, Los Angeles, my alma mater. And Dr. Clayton's singular commitment to preserve African American culture and history was inspired by her desire to ensure that children would know the richness and diversity of African American contributions to the world.

The Mayme A. Clayton Collection of African American History and Culture is comprised of seven main components. They are as follows: rare and out-of-print books, manuscripts, documents, films, music, photographs, and memorabilia. The collection is a remarkable cultural treasure, with a vast ability to educate and to delight. It is our hope that this particular collection will be explored on the Web site to learn more about the collection and why Dr. Mayme Clayton assembled it, and the goals of the Western States Black Research and Educational Center.

It's a research center, and it's scheduled to receive a Federal grant to refurbish its facilities that are located in my district, Culver City, California. The center will be known as the Mayme Clayton Library, and it has housed the largest collection of rare books, films, recordings, and other documents on black Americans outside of the Schomburg Library.

Ms. Clayton's historic efforts have not been in vain, but can rightfully serve as historical and intellectual nourishment for this generation as well as future generations of Americans.

□ 2000

When she learned that there was a location for her rare collection, which she kept in her garage, and I remember going over as a student at UCLA and going through her works for a paper that I had to do, I knew that she would outgrow that space and would have to find a place that could rightfully house such a precious collection. But we found a place for her. It was the old courthouse in Culver City. As you know, you cannot sell a courthouse; so we're on loan. They lent it to us for a period of time, and we're going to see that Federal grants go to that library to preserve this collection.

And I am so pleased to put that name into your psyche because she has skillfully, artfully, and scholarly recorded our history, as written by slaves themselves and written by free men.

Mayme Clayton, a true African American heroine.

Thank you, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, for giving me this time to talk about Mayme Clayton.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I would like to thank my colleague for always being with me and supporting me and the Congressional Black Caucus on issues that we present.

Madam Speaker, I would like to begin this evening by paying tribute to one of my she-roses and a pillar of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio and the Cleveland community, Judge Jean Murrell Capers.

At 95 years of age, Judge Jean Murrell Capers is still ticking and kicking. Known for her feistiness and zest for life, Judge Capers has been a trailblazer for many black women including myself in the law and politics.

A native of Kentucky, Judge Capers moved to Cleveland with her family 88 years ago. She still resides in the family house located in the heart of Cleveland. Judge Capers credits her parents with her success and longevity to the teachings instilled in her by her parents: "My parents provided my four siblings and me with what we needed, not what we wanted. The two things that impact on the individual are heredity and environment. The most important thing for you is to learn."

In 1932 Judge Capers began teaching in the Cleveland Public Schools. She went on to receive her law degree from Case Western Reserve University, which she calls the "Harvard of the Midwest."

Raised as a devout Presbyterian, Judge Capers says that the Bible and the Constitution are the two books she lives by. Through the teachings of the Bible and her Christian upbringing, she learned the importance of serving the community. That belief led her into politics.

Judge Capers began her profession in law and politics in 1945. She was the

first black woman in the United States to be elected a city council member and the first to serve as an assistant county prosecutor in Cuyahoga County. Because of her commitment to her community, Judge Capers was appointed by then Governor James Rhodes to serve as a municipal court judge, a position she was elected to once her appointment expired.

A member of my great sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Judge Capers has accumulated numerous awards including the Frances Payne Bolton Award presented by the Western Reserve Republican Club and has been inducted into the Ohio Women's Hall of Fame.

The interesting thing about Judge Capers' life is the fact that she was born on the very day that Delta Sigma Theta was founded and in the very same year. So we always call her our representative of Delta Sigma Theta.

Widely recognized for her gorgeous hats, Judge Capers continues to be an advocate for all people in the community. She still practices law at the age of 95. I can honestly say there would be no Stephanie Tubbs Jones were it not for Judge Jean Murrell Capers. So tonight I'm pleased to recognize her for her life of service and for all that she does on behalf of candidates throughout the State of Ohio and throughout the United States of America. Tonight she's still actively involved in the presidential elections. Though we're not on the same side, I still love her dearly.

Let me go on to talk now about the Urban League's State of Black America Study. Urban League president and CEO Marc Morial states: "By uplifting black women, especially those struggling hardest to keep their families together and their dreams on track, we lift up every American community."

I want to applaud the Urban League for having the vision to highlight the issues of black women in this country in this year's report. Oftentimes our issues are overlooked and/or marginalized. I would like to share with you a few excerpts from some of the essays featured in this year's report. This year's essayists do a fantastic job of highlighting the many struggles of black women in America.

Black women and the workplace: In her essay "African American Women and Work: Still a Tale of Two Cities," Alexis Herman has this to say regarding the inequality women face in the workplace:

"Over the last 60 years, the labor force participation of women has more than doubled, which means nearly one out of every two workers is a woman. However, this increase in labor force participation was driven largely by non-African American women deciding to work outside their homes. African American women have a long history of working outside of their homes and have the highest labor force participation rate among women, 63.4 percent. Not only are more women working, but more of these working women are

mothers as well. Further, one in four married working women earn more than their husbands. However, many African American women are concentrated in low-paying service jobs or staff positions. African American women are 6 percent of the workforce but 14 percent of workers earning between \$15,000 and \$30,000 per year and are less than 1 percent of workers earning over \$100,000 per year. Not only do African American women earn less, the growth in their earnings has lagged behind that of white women, 19 percent and 29 percent respectively. At the upper end of the earnings distribution, disparities in the labor market impact approximately 1 percent of African American women in corporate officer positions whose earnings are on average \$229,000 compared to \$250,000 for white women."

Taking the conversation even deeper is Dr. Julianne Malveaux, who in her essay, "Shouldering the Third Burden: The status of African American Women," she states:

"The labor market presents the most striking example of the third burden. Black men and women both experience higher unemployment rates than the general population. However, the unemployment and underemployment of black men shifts a disproportionate economic responsibility onto the shoulders of African American women, who then must support households and children without sufficient contribution from their spouses, partners, or fathers. The failure of public policy to create jobs and access to employment in the wake of urban deindustrialization puts African American men at a particular disadvantage and thereby places the burden of family survival on African American women."

Another article about black women and the foreclosure crisis is written by Andrea Harris, the president of the North Carolina Institute for Minority Economic Development, and she had this to say about the impact of the foreclosure crisis and its effect on African American women:

"Nearly two-thirds of the wealth possessed by African American families is in the form of home equity. Without homeownership most of these households own very little and have few opportunities to build economic security. Half of all African American households with children are headed by women; therefore, homeownership is an important economic advantage for these families.

"The 1977 Community Reinvestment Act was enacted to abolish redlining, but it created a market for predatory lending. A recent report by the Consumer Federation of America notes that subprime loans have gone disproportionately to women and that African American and Latina women have the highest rates of subprime lending when compared to all other Americans, especially white men who receive the lowest share of subprime

loans. Moreover, the disparity increases as income increases. In fact, upper-income African American women are more than five times more likely to receive a subprime mortgage than white men. Since subprime borrowers typically refinance from one subprime loan to another, this translates into projected foreclosures for more than one-third of subprime borrowers.

"Considering that over half of all loans made to black borrowers in 2005 and 2006 were subprime and that African American women accounted for 48.8 percent of all African American subprime borrowers in 2006, it is easy to imagine the devastation that is headed toward black women and their communities. A January, 2008, report issued by United for a Fair Economy says that the subprime mortgage crisis will drain \$213 billion in wealth from black Americans, producing for African Americans the greatest wealth loss in modern U.S. history."

Let's talk about black women's health for a moment. Dr. Doris Browne, president and CEO of Brown & Associates, Inc., had these observations about the impact of health disparities on African American women:

"Particularly striking are disparities in the occurrence of illness and death experienced by African Americans caused by higher rates of cardiovascular disease, cancer, stroke, diabetes, AIDS, and a shorter life expectancy. For instance, heart disease is the leading cause of death for women in the United States. However, the death rate for heart disease is 20 percent higher for African American women than white women. In addition, cancer is the second leading cause of death among women; yet the 5-year survival rate is 10 percent lower for African American women compared to their white female counterparts. Also, 15 million black women in the United States are afflicted with diabetes, roughly double the number of U.S. white women who are diagnosed with the disease.

"With regard to HIV and AIDS, 61 percent of those under age 25 with a diagnosis of HIV/AIDS are African American, and African American women are diagnosed with AIDS at a rate nearly 24 times higher than white women. Black women are more likely to be infected by heterosexual means, sexual contact with men who are HIV positive, compared to other racial and ethnic groups. Possible explanations for these disparities are the complex interaction of biological factors, environment, ethnicity, insurance, and certain health behaviors or life-style choices. Equally important are the effects of socioeconomic factors such as education and income in creating health disparities. For African American women, poverty, race, and ethnicity play a significant role in lower health quality and health outcomes.

"Overcoming persistent health disparities and promoting healthy behaviors for African Americans is a formi-

dable health challenge. African American women must devote more time to care for their own health needs because health education, awareness, and screening are essential in preventing and controlling chronic diseases in women."

All of these points that have been made in this wonderful publication by the Urban League point to issues that predominate in the African American community, which particularly fall upon African American women in our country. The Urban League should be applauded for focusing in on the state of black women in America. And we focus in again around education, around health care, around job opportunities, around income within the workplace.

When we have been looking at issues around women and the workplace, one of the things that we have noticed persistently is that women still only make about 70 cents of every dollar that men make in the workplace, and we have to continue to fight for our opportunity to be paid equally in the workplace. It becomes even a greater dilemma as we focus in on the foreclosure crisis, which has caused so many families to go under.

In the State of Ohio, 90,000 houses or homes in Ohio are in the predatory lending process. I am told that the number across the country is somewhere around 900,000 families or houses in this country are in debt or in trouble as a result of the foreclosure crisis. It becomes even more important that Members of Congress and my colleagues begin to focus in on these issues and try to do what we can to assist those families in the process.

One of the dilemmas that we really face as well is, though, that the proposals that have been placed upon the table to try to fix the foreclosure process have not really focused on the people who are stuck in the foreclosure. They are more focused on the banking and financial institutions than on the people and the process.

□ 2015

We need to push as Members of Congress to make sure that we pursue other opportunities to assist people who are really in need of our support.

It is exciting as we go on and celebrate Black History Month and Women's History Month together that we think about all the great leaders and great women who have come before us in this country.

I had an opportunity about 2 weeks ago to be in Akron, Ohio, with a group of women. We were focusing on Women's History Month and that great woman, Sojourner Truth, an African American woman who was a leader in the suffragette movement, even though she recognized back then, even though she fought on behalf of the suffragette movement, that she as an African American woman would not have the opportunity to have the right to vote, even if she won the suffragette movement.

We recalled in our discussion this great speech that she gave that was called "Ain't I a Woman?" and she talked about that she had worked and slaved in cotton fields, that she was able to till the land just like a man, that she was able to cut down trees like a man and she said, But ain't I a woman? And she went on to talk about the fact that women across this country have worked very hard and very diligently but, in fact, they have not been given the rights or recognition that they should. And she ends this great speech by saying, if one woman can be determined to have turned this world upside down, surely all the women in this room ought to be able to turn it right side up again. And then she said, And the men ought to let them do it.

So it is an exciting time as we focus in on Women's History Month that we have a time to reflect on great women like Sojourner Truth and others who were leading the charge to make sure that women had the right to vote and participate in the process.

I am excited to discuss in that same vein 22 women, and these 22 women were the founders of my sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated. These 22 women had been part of another sorority and decided that they wanted to be more focused on political and social issues and created Delta Sigma Theta Sorority at Howard University back in 1913, the same year that Judge Jean Murrell Capers was born. Part of their first act was to participate in the suffragette march.

I gave a speech the other day that was interesting in the conversation that the people who put the march together, they wanted to push all the African American women to the back of the march because they knew that they would not be able to vote, but the African American women started participating in the march and they said, to heck with this, we're going to be at the front. And so they moved around the march and moved to the front of the march on behalf of the people that are represented. So it was really women who were participating in the forefront that clearly had the chance to give us or set the example for what we should be able to do.

I am just so pleased to have had this opportunity on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to talk about Women's History Month, to talk about African American women who have done such a great job in the process. I am confident that my colleagues would have been here this evening but for other commitments and that is why I have sought to have the privilege to have them be able to revise and extend their remarks so that they can add information to this particular time.

It is always great to have a chance to participate in these Special Orders on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus; our Chair, CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK; our Vice Chair, BARBARA LEE, who happens to be the Speaker in the chair right now.

Madam Speaker, with that I am willing to yield back the balance of my time such that the next person who has a Special Order can come forward. I thank you for the time.

SIMPLIFYING THE TAX CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. And I thank the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it has been said over and over again that nothing in this life is certain except death and taxes. I was a practicing physician for over 25 years back in Texas and I've got to tell you, sometimes death seems a little less complicated than our Tax Code. The complexity of the Tax Code has done nothing but grow since the Federal income tax was first introduced in this body in 1913.

When it was first created, the Tax Code was 400 pages. This year, it is 67,506 pages, nearly a 17,000 percent increase, pretty typical of government math. Because I'm a visual person, I would like to show you what the statistics look like.

Here is a picture from the "CCH Standard Federal Tax Reporter" illustrating the exponential increase in the Tax Code. What this demonstrates, Madam Speaker, is way back here in 1913, we had one little 400-page book that was the Federal Tax Code, and then we fast forward to 2007 and 2008 and you see the number of pages now that fill the bookshelf, making the complexity of the code something that the average person, quite honestly just does not understand.

Madam Speaker, remember that one of the fundamental tenets of the American legal system, including the tax system, is that ignorance of the law is no excuse. Therefore, in theory, every single American who is merely trying to comply with the Tax Code and file their taxes by April 15 is supposed to be familiar with all of the 67,000 some odd pages that are contained within the Tax Code which comprise the tax rules.

Now, I don't know if my tax preparer back home knows all of the 67,506 pages and you have to wonder about other people in other congressional districts. What about the small business owner? What about the single mom who is just struggling to get by? How are they ever going to know all of the regulations contained within 67,506 pages of the U.S. Tax Code?

The complexity of the Tax Code is a result of countless deductions and exemptions aimed at steering a social agenda, quite honestly, when it's supposed to be a Tax Code. That's one of the fundamental problems with our tax system, is that we try to enforce social policy through the Tax Code rather than seeing the Tax Code simply as a vehicle for collecting those revenues

that the government has to collect in order to run. Special interest groups run rampant through every single page of that 67,000 pages. Anytime Congress wants to punish a special interest group or reward another, Congress adds a new credit or a new law to the mammoth Tax Code. The result is a Federal law fraught with opportunities for avoiding taxes and loopholes to be exploited at the expense of fellow Americans. Everyone is familiar with the problems inherent in our convoluted Tax Code, and criticizing the American Tax Code is as American as apple pie and baseball, and for good reason.

Let me share just a few interesting facts on why we need fundamental tax reform. Each year, Americans spend 6.5 billion hours preparing their tax forms, and businesses spend 800 million hours complying with the Tax Code. The cost of compliance for Federal taxpayers filling out returns and related chores was \$265 billion in 2005. The average taxpayer pays over \$1,800 per household in compliance costs. In other words, that taxpayer works a little over a week just to pay for the cost of preparing his or her taxes for that year.

A study was done back in 1998 when the forms in 1998 were less complicated than they are 10 years later, and it surveyed 46 tax experts. Each expert came up with 46 different answers when determining tax liability. Forty-six preparers, each given the same set of data, 46 different figures to determine tax liability. The tax calculations themselves ranged some \$34,000 to \$68,000, almost a doubling of the original estimated amount.

The Tax Foundation prepared the following information that actually I think will be of interest to this body:

In the year 2007, a person spent 79 days working to pay for their Federal taxes and 41 days on State and local taxes for a grand total of 120 days. That's more than health care, more than housing, more than transportation. And, honestly, you can see an immediate return on those categories. It's a little bit more difficult to see the tangible return on Federal tax dollars, albeit those are the moneys that are required to have the Federal Government run. But when you look at the bite that taxes take out of the average income compared with all of the other expenditures, it truly is significant.

We all complain about paying our taxes. The fact is if the system was fair and simple, it would be a lot easier to take. Americans don't mind paying for roads. They pay for a strong defense. They pay for health care for your grandmother. It's the fact that one family makes exactly the same amount as the family next door, but they're forced to pay a higher share of the tax burden. The Declaration of Independence says all men are created equal, and that should apply to the tax burden as well.

Now, let me just show you a breakdown by congressional district. Most Members of Congress should be inter-

ested in this chart, also produced by the Tax Foundation. In 2004, the Tax Foundation ranked Federal individual income tax burden by congressional district. My district, the 26th District of Texas, falls here somewhere in the middle, and it is highlighted in yellow so its easy for me to see, but it compares the ranking of Federal income tax burden as a percentage of the adjusted gross income versus the ranking of the average income tax liability per return. In other words, with identical incomes, we have some States with a much higher burden and some States with a much lower burden.

Now that is an average across the population, so clearly there will be some differences, but we see New York represented in both the upper and the lower categories. We see California likewise represented in both the upper and the lower categories. So it's not inconceivable that the discrepancy should not be that large; but, nevertheless, because of the complexity of the Tax Code, that's one of the things we're left with.

435 Members of Congress and here is the data from the top seven compared to the bottom seven. You can definitely see varying tax liabilities throughout the country. Again, my district ranked 139th in regards to the Federal income tax burden as a percentage of gross income, but ranked only 127 as the average income tax liability per return. Again, that's more of the Federal Government's math for you.

And yet another aspect of complying with our Tax Code. Time is precious. We often don't have enough of it for personal things, those mundane things like earning a living, raising your family, spending time with your friends, and then there's the dollars-and-cents side of the equation where, in fact, time is money and valuable resources are misspent navigating tax law instead of spent growing the economy and creating jobs. Taken together, this is a strong prescription for real change in our Tax Code.

We know what works when it comes to changing the Tax Code because we got a glimpse of it when during Ronald Reagan's administration he cut the Tax Code in half in 1986. As a result of that reform, the economy grew, revenues increased and jobs were created. I can't think of a better prescription for our slowing economy today than replicating the reform of the Tax Code on an even greater scale.

So what should we do? The prescription is fairly simple. Flatten the tax, broaden the base and shift the burden away from families and small businesses. Simplify the Tax Code and make it easier for individuals and businesses to file their taxes and pay their fair share. Even the National Taxpayer Advocate, Nina Olsen, stated simplify the Tax Code as one of her recommendations in the 2007 Annual Report to Congress:

"The complexity of the code increases the likelihood that honest taxpayers will make inadvertent mistakes, creates opportunities for taxpayers to avoid paying their fair share of taxes, and makes it difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to administer the tax system. Simplifying the tax law could improve the audit process and allow less taxpayer burden."

□ 2030

Pretty simple stuff. Pretty straightforward. If the National Taxpayer Advocate thinks it is best for our constituents if we simplify the system, it would make sense that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle would agree with this sentiment and work toward this goal.

Now, this next data I need to credit to some polling done by American Solutions. They conducted a nationwide poll on six different topics, with one being taxes and jobs. This poll crossed gender, ethnicity, economic and party lines, and they discovered the following opinions in America. Under taxes and jobs, 69 percent think the Federal income tax system is unfair. Seventy percent favor tax incentives for companies who keep their headquarters in the United States of America. What a great concept. Eight-two percent think the option of a single rate system would give taxpayers the convenience of filing their taxes with just a single sheet of paper. Pretty powerful stuff. Eight-two percent want to be able to file on a single sheet of paper.

Madam Speaker, it sounds to me as if America has spoken fairly clearly on this subject, and the evidence is that we do need real change in our tax system. The encouraging news is that we have a practical and effective blueprint for making this real change across-the-board. The blueprint is called the flat tax.

In 1981, Robert Hall and Alvin Rabushka proposed a new and radically simple structure that would transform the Internal Revenue System and our economy by creating a single rate of taxation for all Americans. Today, several States have implemented a single rate tax structure for their State income taxes and from Utah to Massachusetts, citizens are seeing the benefit.

In Colorado, a single rate generated so much income, so much revenue, that lawmakers actually reduced the rate 10 years after its implementation. In the State of Indiana, the economy boomed after a single rate went into effect in 2003, and in that time corporate income tax receipts have risen 250 percent.

In 1981, a simple concept put forth by Robert Hall and Alvin Rabushka, revisited in 1995 by my predecessor in this body, former majority leader Dick Armey, and, most recently, within the last couple of years, a book published by Steven Forbes on the flat tax revolution. All of those authors, all of those authors calling for the same type of reform in our Tax Code, to allow it to be flatter, fairer and simpler.

Now we have got several Members of Congress who are actually working on the problem. Certainly it is something that I remain focused on. Congressman DAVID DREIER from California, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, and PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, are all working to establish the single tax rate structure for the United States. Members are working on it in the other body as well. Each of us have our own ideas. The legislation proposed is a little bit different, but it all has at the center of it the concept that you should be able to file your taxes on a single form at a much flatter rate that will be fairer across-the-board, and, in fact, evidence has shown that it will actually increase revenue.

The bill that I introduced actually two Congresses ago, and I have continued to introduce it every year, H.R. 1040, it makes it easy to remember the number, H.R. 1040 allows for a person to opt in to a flat tax. They can't go back and forth from the old IRS code and the flat tax, but if they elect to go into the flat tax, they may do so.

If quite honestly they have constructed their family or business finances such that they have been trying to utilize the code to maximize their effectiveness, no one is going to require them to go into the flat tax. They may stay under the old IRS code. But for a lot of people like myself, regardless of whether I would come up better or worse under the flat tax, just to give up that shoe box full of receipts every year, to give up that quality time spent with my accountant every year, to give up that \$1,800 or \$2,500 that I spend every year on tax preparation, and I promise you, mine are not that complicated, I would gladly give that up to be able to simply file my taxes on a single page form, or, better yet, populate a field on a computer screen on the Internet, click a mouse, send it in, and be done with it for the year.

Now, we all may not agree on just a single rate. I have mentioned some other individuals that have other bills, and they do have different approaches. We may not all agree on whether it should be a single rate or two rates, as it was back when Ronald Reagan simplified the Tax Code. We may prefer a tax method that does allow for deductions for mortgages or charitable contributions. But regardless, regardless, each of them embodies the fundamental principle that each American should bear the burden of taxation equally and at the lowest rate possible; we think everyone should be able to do their own taxes without the help of a professional and should be confident that people who earn the same income pay the same taxes.

Madam Speaker, just as an aside, I remember back in the year 1993, I was just a regular guy working in a medical practice back home in Texas. It just so happened that that year, the President of the United States and myself had an

almost identical income reported. And yet when you calculated what I paid as a percentage of income, it was in excess of 30 percent. When you calculated what the other individual paid, it was around 20 percent. So why the discrepancy? With the same amount of earned income, why should there be such a vast difference in the taxes owed and the taxes paid? That is really what got me to thinking about this subject, many, many years ago.

We all remember when the Tax Code was changed in 1993. It was changed retroactively so that we got both the rich and the dead involved in paying additional taxes. But it really got me focused. Then in 1995 when Congressman Armey published his book on the flat tax, I read it, I became a believer, and have continued to study the issue and have continued to talk about the issue. And this is the time of year to have these types of talks, because I do think it is important, regardless of which party is in power, that we take seriously the will of the American people. Eight-two percent, 82 percent, want to be able to fill out a single page form and be done with their taxes.

Just by way of comparison, according to the Wall Street Journal, citing a blog off the National Taxpayers Union website, there are about 1.2 million or more professional tax preparers during tax season, which equals roughly the population of Hawaii. There are 836,000 doctors in the United States. As a physician, I think that there is something a little askew with this number, that we require half again as many tax preparers in the country as we do physicians. Healers shouldn't be outnumbered by tax preparers. The government math stuff is starting to scare me, and really should start to scare a lot of Americans.

Also, according to the Wall Street Journal, more than half of the individual taxpayers now use a paid preparer for their income tax return. I do myself. Mine is not that complicated, but I don't dare go into the process without a professional guiding me, lest someone at some point say, hey, you made a mistake. I want a professional with me if I had to go in to justify what those numbers read on the form.

We actually anticipate the number of people using a paid preparer to increase this year. In 1960, less than a fifth of taxpayers used preparers. More than half now. Less than a fifth, less than 20 percent, back in 1960. In 2005, one of the most famous tax preparation companies garnered \$2.4 billion in revenue from the United States in tax preparation, up from \$841 million 10 years before in 1996. Pretty astounding. Pretty astounding figures when you stop and think about it.

Now, I respect and I fully appreciate everything that my tax preparer does for me, what my accountant does for me, what tax preparation companies do, and I think it is a shame that Congress has created a system that is so complicated that more than half of the

public feel a need to pay someone, to pay someone else, just to figure out how much they owe for their tax liability. The system doesn't have to be that complicated.

Now, bear with me, if you would, through one last poster, and this really sums it up. A faster, flatter, fairer tax structure, let me show you how it works. It is pretty simple.

Here we go. You put in a little bit of information, like your name; a little bit of identification data, income, personal exemptions, married filing jointly, single head of household; number of dependents. You add up your deductions. Taxable income is line 1 minus line 3. One subtraction equation on the form. And then calculate the amount of tax owed on this particular form, calculate by multiplying line 4 by 0.19. The tax is already withheld. Your tax refund you are owed or the taxes you are to pay. What did that take? According to the clock up there, a little less than 30 seconds. Thirty seconds, and your income taxes are done.

Now, in all honesty, I haven't started my taxes this year. Please don't tell my accountant. But I will spend the better part of a Saturday afternoon, probably this coming Saturday, going to all those places in the house where I have secreted away little receipts and things that I knew I would need when it came time to prepare my taxes. I will gather all of this stuff together and put it in a form that is presentable, take another half day and spend that with my accountant. He will spend several weeks churning it through whatever computer program that he uses. And then right before midnight on April 15th, I will get my tax form to sign, and I will send it in and I will either pay a little in taxes or I will get a little bit of refund.

But look at this. Thirty seconds. Your name, a little bit of identification data, a couple of numbers that are easy to obtain, and taxes are already withheld, your tax liability or your tax refund. No expensive tax attorney bills. No more hours of stressful research trying to figure out whether your military service or your marital status will adversely affect your return. No more headaches trying to determine where the estimated tax payments go. No more Congress taking one special interest group over the other trying to create social good works through the Tax Code. Instead, just a very simple and straightforward system. And remember that number: 82 percent of Americans want something simple like this for their tax preparation.

Now, in my opinion a single tax rate structure would eliminate taxes on capital gains, eliminate taxes on dividends and taxes on savings. You know, we always hear that our savings rate in this country is really pretty low, and that in fact is one of the things that may be behind some of the financial crisis that we find ourselves in now.

I will just tell you there was a time when I was in business for myself that

I thought the prudent thing to do would be to hold three months, three months, of operating capital in some easily convertible security, like a CD, something that was fairly liquid, earn a little bit of interest along the way, and have that money in case the dire wolf was ever at the door and I needed those funds to continue to operate my business. It seemed like a prudent thing to do.

But here is the deal. You earn some interest, but guess what? It is taxed at regular income rates. So it is suddenly eroded by, at that time almost a half, now around a third. And then if you ever get to the point where, okay, I am going to bring that money back into the business and pay it out in salary, well, guess what? If you have held it for over a year in that money market or CD, your business had to report that and pay taxes on it at the end of that first year, and then when you do disperse it as earnings to the owners of the business, guess what? It is taxed again. So it got taxed twice.

So for doing the prudent thing, the prudent thing, holding 3 months of capital in a relatively liquid account so you can get to it if you need it, for doing the prudent thing, you are punished on the interest you earn. So that is not a good deal. You have got to pay taxes on it from your business, and, oh, by the way, if you ever do pay it out to yourself in salary, you get taxed again. So you have been taxed three times on that money that you thought you were doing the right thing. You were putting it away against perhaps a lean month or two. Maybe those Medicare payments didn't come through as fast as I would like, or, God forbid, the SGR cut my payment again for Medicare reimbursement, I would have a little cash to fall back on. But, guess what. If you do that, if you do that, you are actually hurt.

□ 2045

If we were to change the Tax Code, again, with a single rate structure, no capital gains tax, no taxes on dividends, no taxes on savings, which is extremely important, and I personally would eliminate the Clinton tax on Social Security earnings, what would happen? Personal savings would increase.

Would that be a bad thing? Does anyone in this body think personal savings would be a bad thing, particularly given our current economic situation? Businesses might just actually expand and create jobs. Would that be a bad thing given our job creation numbers this past month? We lost a bunch. We didn't create anything.

Without the heavy corporate income tax, which is currently the second highest in the industrialized world, companies would have less incentive to offshore their headquarters and offshore their earnings. If they had less incentive, and those earnings and headquarters stayed in this country, wouldn't that ultimately be a good thing for the state of our economy?

So it really comes down to an all-American principle of freedom, and it comes in a prescription. The decision to move to a single-rate system would be entirely up to the business, not up to the government. This would be an optional program. If someone has constructed their domestic finances or their business finances to maximize their earnings under the current Federal Tax Code, stay in the code, that would be your choice.

But if you are tired of the shoe box, if you want to fill out a single-page return, single-page form, and then have the rest of that time, that half day I am going to spend on Saturday and that other half day I am going to spend on a week, if you would rather have that day to spend with your family, take a personal day off, go fishing, whatever, earn more money, whatever, that's yours. You don't owe it to the government any more.

A flat tax would be less costly. It would save taxpayers \$100 billion a year and would reduce cost of compliance by over 90 percent. The resulting increase in personal savings, well, wait a minute, didn't we just pass a big stimulus package? That would have an immediate effect on our American economy by putting that money back in the hands of productive people in this country.

As I said earlier, recent polling by American Solutions shows that over 80 percent of Americans favor an optional, single-page, one-page tax form with one rate. After all, is anybody really going to complain if this one time, this one time Congress does something worthwhile and actually makes something easier? After all, who could complain about making something easier, especially a process that comes with such a high cost?

One of the things we haven't even talked about, and you now hear talked about all the time, is the compliance gap, the 200 to 300 to \$350 billion that it's estimated that is owed in taxes but it's not paid in taxes because it's simply too hard to go through all that you have to go through to comply with the IRS code or you are worried about making a mistake and going to jail for misrepresenting yourself on your tax form.

So that compliance gap, the tax gap as it is called, you will hear people talk a bit on both sides of the aisle. They want to utilize, well we are going to go out and do a better job of collecting the taxes, so we will use that \$350 billion to offset an increase in the farm program or AMT patch, or, God forbid, we would fix the SGR formula for patients and doctors across the country. But you always hear people talk about that tax gap that they are going to collect that \$300 billion and put it to some other good work, but this gets rid of the tax gap. It's gone tomorrow.

You wouldn't have to worry about people not complying with the code because it would be so simple. The cost of not complying would be high. The cost

of complying would become much more bearable.

Well, guess what? This is a very political year. Everywhere you go, people are talking about change.

I will tell you what, I haven't heard the word "change" so much since I was an intern at the newborn nursery at the Parkland Hospital back in the 1970s. Everyone is talking about change. You turn on the television, people are talking about change.

Let's consider how that change could improve one of the most complicated of institutions, the Internal Revenue Service. More importantly, let's consider how that change could deliver prosperity, deliver time back to America's families and to America's taxpayers.

You know what, when it gets right down to it, that's a stimulus, that's a stimulus that every American could understand and every American could be for. That's a stimulus package that everyone on the floor of this House should consider and vote for.

I have got a bill, H.R. 1040. Ranking Member DREIER has a bill, Ranking Member PAUL RYAN has a bill. I think all of those are worth looking at. I would like to see those brought up in the appropriate committee of Ways and Means, the Subcommittee on Taxation. Let's have the debate; let's have the argument. Let's do it out in the open. Let the American people hear our debate, and let them decide who is arguing on their behalf and who is arguing on behalf of the special interests. I think it would become quite clear after just a few minutes of that debate.

Again, here is an opportunity to give time and money back to the American people. That is a stimulus package of which this body, both sides of the aisle, could be justifiably proud.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 9:07 p.m.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 9:07 p.m.

□ 2110

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 895, ESTABLISHING AN OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-547) on the resolution (H. Res. 1031) providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 895) establishing

within the House of Representatives an Office of Congressional Ethics, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 11, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 11 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical leave.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today, March 11, 12 and 13.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, March 14.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, March 13.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today, March 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 14.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, March 11.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, March 11, 12, 13 and 14.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 25. Providing for the appointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 11, 2008, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5651. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008 as required by the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund provision in Title VI of Division A of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-116; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5652. A letter from the Chief, Congressional Action Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of a performance decision on the public-private competition affecting Detachment 1, Training Support Squadron, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5653. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment [Docket No. NHTSA-2007-28322] (RIN: 2127-AJ75) received February 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5654. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2008 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2008 [Docket No. NHTSA-2007-28497] (RIN: 2127-AJ97) received February 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5655. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of 2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 FCC 07-216 [MB Docket 06-121 etc.] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5656. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Peach Springs, Arizona) [MB Docket No. 07-164 RM-11386] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5657. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of The Commission's Cable Horizontal and Vertical Ownership Limits Implementation of Section 11 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 Implementation of Cable Act Reform Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 Review of the Commission's Regulations Governing Attribution of Broadcast and Cable/MDS Interests Review of the Commission's Regulations and Policies Affecting Investment in the Broadcast Industry Reexamination of the Commission's Cross-Interest Policy [MM Docket No.

92-264 CS Docket No. 98-82 CS Docket No. 96-85 MM Docket No. 94-150 MM Docket No. 92-51 MM to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5658. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Comp. Bur., Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matters of Telephone Numbers Requirements for IP-Enabled Services Providers Local Numbers Portability Porting Interval and Validation Requirements IP-Enabled Services Telephone Number Portability CTIA Petitions for Declaratory Ruling on Wireline-Wireless Porting Issues Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis Numbering Resource Optimization [WC Docket No. 07-243 WC Docket No. 07-244 WC Docket No. 04-36 CC Docket No. 95-116 CC Docket No. 99-200] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5659. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Leased Commercial Access [MB Docket No. 07-42] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5660. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Blanket Authorization Under FPA Section 203 [Docket No. RM07-21-000; Order No. 708] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5661. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Cross-Subsidization Restrictions on Affiliate Transactions [Docket No. RM07-15-000; Order No. 707] received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5662. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Delegated Authority to Order Use of Procedure for Access to Certain Sensitive Unclassified Information (RIN: 3150-A132) received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5663. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an annual report required by section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, pursuant to Public Law 104-164, section 655(a) (110 Stat. 1435); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5664. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, and Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, certification for calendar year 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5665. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on "Overseas Surplus Property," pursuant to Public Law 105-277, section 2215; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5666. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles to the Governments of Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa, and Malaysia (Transmittal No.

DDTC 014-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5667. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency blocking property of persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5668. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5669. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Guajon (*Eleutherodactylus cooki*) (RIN: 1018-AU46) received February 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5670. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — CROSS-WAIVER OF LIABILITY (RIN: 2700-AB51) received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5671. A letter from the Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for New Qualified Alternative Motor Vehicles (Qualified Fuel Cell Motor Vehicles) [Notice 2008-33] received February 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5672. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Purchase Price Safe Harbors for Sections 143 and 25 (Rev. Proc. 2008-17) received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5673. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program: Medicare Secondary Payer (MSP) Amendments [CMS-6272-F] (RIN: 0938-AN27) received February 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[The following action occurred on March 7, 2008]

Mr. SPRATT: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 312. Resolution revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 (Rept. 110-543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on March 10, 2008]

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution

936. Resolution honoring the 200th anniversary of the Gallatin Report on Roads and Canals, celebrating the national unity the Gallatin Report engendered, and recognizing the vast contributions that national planning efforts have provided to the United States; with amendments (Rept. 110-544). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5492. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to construct a greenhouse facility at its museum support facility in Suitland, Maryland, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BERMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5501. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-546 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. SUTTON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1031. Resolution providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 895) establishing within the House of Representatives an Office of Congressional Ethics, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-547). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5501 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of March 6, 2008]

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2176. A bill to provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Bay Mills Indian Community, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Judiciary for a period ending not later than April 4, 2008, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k) of rule X (Rept. 110-541, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4115. A bill to provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Judiciary for a period ending not later than April 4, 2008, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k) of rule X (Rept. 110-542, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 5561. A bill to amend the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 to provide for a temporary increase in the maximum loan guaranty amount for housing loans guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 5562. A bill to authorize the National Guard to provide support for the border control activities of the United States Customs

and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5563. A bill to reauthorize and reform the national service laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. POE, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 5564. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude an individual who has been convicted of committing certain sex offenses from receiving certain burial-related benefits and funeral honors which are otherwise available to certain veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and related individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a Federal income tax credit for certain home purchases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 5566. A bill to amend the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 to provide for a temporary increase in the maximum loan guaranty amount for housing loans guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 5567. A bill to rescind earmarks designated in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 5568. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify requirements relating to the construction of a physical fence along the southwest border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 5569. A bill to extend for 5 years the EB-5 regional center pilot program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 5570. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the sunset in the special immigrant nonminister religious worker visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 5571. A bill to extend for 5 years the program relating to waiver of the foreign country residence requirement with respect to international medical graduates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 5572. A bill to stimulate the economy of the United States by providing assistance to States for foreclosure mitigation counseling activities and increased community development block grant assistance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a lump-sum payment for certain Federal employees who retire with a substantial amount of unused sick leave for which they would not otherwise receive any compensation or benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 5574. A bill to prohibit the transport of hydrolysate from the Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, or the Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, to an off-site location; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mr. EHLERS):

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to honor the 5 years of service and sacrifice of our troops and their families in the war in Iraq and to remember those who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan and throughout the world; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAGEN (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H. Res. 1032. A resolution recognizing former Green Bay Packers quarterback Brett Favre on the occasion of his retirement from the National Football League, and honoring him for his years of commitment to the city of Green Bay and the State of Wisconsin, and his extensive charitable activities in Wisconsin and his home State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. DOYLE):

H. Res. 1033. A resolution honoring Mr. Myron Cope for his 35 years of service to southwest Pennsylvania and as the voice of the Pittsburgh Steelers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 63: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 87: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 211: Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 333: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 406: Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HILL, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHULER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 522: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 623: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 715: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 818: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 914: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 992: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1014: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1043: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1078: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1090: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1178: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1187: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1188: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1228: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1279: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 1282: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1321: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1363: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1418: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1512: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1554: Mr. PASTOR and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 1621: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1645: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1653: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1730: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 1738: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1774: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1897: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1927: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 2016: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2066: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2131: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2189: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2332: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2514: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2526: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2548: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2588: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 2652: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2702: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2734: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 2744: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2747: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2792: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2851: Mr. PLATTS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2894: Mr. FILNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WU, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2964: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2965: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3014: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3132: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3232: Mr. SIRE, Mrs. BONO Mack, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 3234: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 3282: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 3309: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 3326: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 3337: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3366: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 3438: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 3439: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3514: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. REYES, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3533: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 3618: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3637: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 3646: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3660: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 3696: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3754: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3769: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3799: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. DELAULO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3819: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3836: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3846: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3896: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3934: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 3980: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4008: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 4048: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4055: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4071: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 4083: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4138: Mr. GORDON and Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 4236: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WU, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4248: Ms. FALLIN and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 4296: Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 4308: Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. McKEON.
 H.R. 4355: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 4544: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 4790: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4847: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 4884: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 4900: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 4959: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 5036: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 5109: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 5110: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SPACE.
 H.R. 5148: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 5236: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. POE.
 H.R. 5401: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 5443: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 5474: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 5475: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 5481: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 5483: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 5513: Ms. FOXX.
 H.R. 5515: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FEENEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5532: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 5534: Mr. CAMPBELL of California and Ms. SUTTON.
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CLAY.
 H. Con. Res. 262: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. SOUDER.
 H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. Wilson of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr.

LATHAM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Con. Res. 302: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. OLIVER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MICA, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. REYES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACK, and Mr. UPTON.
 H. Con. Res. 305: Mr. OLIVER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H. Res. 76: Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 123: Mr. ELLISON.
 H. Res. 169: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H. Res. 351: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Res. 407: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 543: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H. Res. 672: Mr. MARKEY.
 H. Res. 821: Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Res. 834: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 896: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LEE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H. Res. 924: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H. Res. 939: Mr. BUYER.
 H. Res. 958: Mr. PITTS.
 H. Res. 962: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 973: Mr. BACA.
 H. Res. 977: Mr. SPACE.
 H. Res. 991: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. LOEBACK.
 H. Res. 992: Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H. Res. 1004: Mr. POE and Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 1005: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
 H. Res. 1021: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 1022: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Res. 1023: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H. Res. 1026: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2008

No. 40

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JIM WEBB, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, as we begin another workweek, humble us under Your mighty hand, that in due time You may exalt us.

As our lawmakers grapple with today's challenges, give them the humility to cast their cares on You, for You possess great love for them. Remind them that You sustain the universe by Your providential power and that nothing is too difficult for You to accomplish. Let not their hearts be troubled by overwhelming obstacles, but may they run with patience the race that is set before them. Inspire their thinking, strengthen their resolve, and give them success in their efforts.

We pray in the Name of Him who is the author and finisher of our faith. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JIM WEBB led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2008.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JIM WEBB, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WEBB thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m. Senators will be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. Following morning business, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget. There will be no rollcall votes today.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2734

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2734 is at the desk and due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2734) to aid families and neighborhoods facing home foreclosure and address the subprime mortgage crisis.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in an hour we are starting the budget. Under the law that governs what we do, there is 50 hours of debate on this matter. It is one of the few items in the Senate that has a time certain. The good news is that we have Senators CONRAD and GREGG who will be managing this. They are two experts on money within this body. They work extremely well together. They disagree on a number of issues in the budget, but they approach it in a gentlemanly fashion. They are, in my estimation, two of the finest Senators this body has ever had. As far as matters relating to money, they are, in my years of service here in the Senate, really outstanding. They are friends. They are adversaries. They do it in a way that should make the Senate and the country proud. That is the good news.

The bad news is that other than the time limit on this budget, there are a lot of changes we talk about needing to make, and we have for years, but we haven't made them, which means we come to a point where we have what is called the vote-athon, which means Senators have an unlimited number of opportunities to offer amendments. Until the Chair rules that it is a dilatory tactic, that can go on for a long period of time.

I have explained to the Republican leader—we talked at some length on one occasion on the telephone—that we are going to finish this bill this week. The question is, we would like to do it on Thursday. It is my understanding that all the Presidentials will be here on Thursday. They will be here on Friday if we don't finish this bill on Thursday. They will be here on Saturday if we don't finish the bill on Friday. I hope we can work toward finishing this bill sometime Thursday. It

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1785

is my recollection that we did it last year on Thursday. That is what we are facing. As a result, we will work to see if we can have a process that is fair and gives people the opportunity to offer the amendments they believe are important.

There are a number of issues we know. I think Senators GREGG and CONRAD will agree there are probably four main issues that are going to be extremely controversial in the budget this year. We will work toward having a time that we can complete that.

This week marks the 75th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's first fireside chat. In his first fireside chat on March 12, 1933, President Roosevelt reassured the American people that despite the fear and uncertainty of a banking crisis and a deeply troubled economy, working people—or, in his words, “average citizens”—would be just fine.

He said:

You . . . must have faith; you must not be stampeded by rumors or guesses.

Let us unite in banishing fear. We have provided the machinery to restore our financial system, and it is up to you to support and make it work. It is your problem, my friends, your problem no less than mine. Together we cannot fail.

President Roosevelt was right. With President Roosevelt's leadership and the grit and determination of the American people, our country not only survived the Great Depression but embraced a new era of prosperity. That success was due in no small part to President Roosevelt's understanding that working Americans built our country and working Americans were critical to our continued prosperity.

Seven years ago, President George Bush inherited a budget surplus for the year of more than \$200 billion, the result of a responsible Clinton administration economic policy. These surpluses were projected to continue for the foreseeable future.

Now 7 years into the Bush administration, we find that tax breaks for big business and the superwealthy have combined with \$12 billion per month war in Iraq and cuts to investments in our workforce and infrastructure to create a budget deficit of more than \$400 billion and a national debt that has grown by \$3 trillion. The result: an economy that is failing millions of American families.

President Bush said last week that he doesn't believe America is headed toward a recession. You have to hunt hard to find an economist who would agree with him. The question is no longer are we headed for a recession but how long and how deep it will be.

For the second month in a row, the American economy lost jobs—22,000 in January, 63,000 in February. Who bore the worst of this job loss? People who work in the manufacturing industry, people who work in construction, people who build homes. It is not manufacturing that lost jobs; it is not construction that lost jobs; it is the people who

work in those industries that cause those industries to be deemed as losing jobs.

In 7 years of Bush economics, oil is up to an alltime high. Today, the last I looked, it was over \$107 a barrel. Gas prices are double what they were when the President took office, and they are climbing. The average gallon of gasoline in America now is about \$3.20 a gallon. The highest gasoline is in San Francisco; the lowest is in Casper, WY. The cost of college is up by some 60 percent since President Bush took office. Health care costs are up 80 percent since President Bush took office. Has anything gone down? Yes. Annual household income is down by \$1,000.

Who has prospered from 7 years of Bush economics? At parties and private meetings, President Bush's CEO friends and oil buddies must be telling him the economy is doing great, because they are doing really well. Exxon, for example, made the highest net profit of any company in the history of the country. It is no wonder the President doesn't see a recession coming, because the people he deals with are doing just fine. Look at the enormous compensation packages earned by CEOs of companies that have been failures: Contrywide, Citigroup, Merrill Lynch. These compensation packages were in the hundreds of millions of dollars for companies that were failing, even as their industry has spiraled downward and the consumers they serve have suffered. The middle class has not done so well. They have been forgotten. They have been left behind.

After 7 years of fiscal irresponsibility, consider what President Bush wants to do next. His budget calls for spending \$51 billion to hand out more tax breaks for Americans with incomes of greater than \$1 million. That works out that each of these millionaires will get \$125,000—all to a fortunate few who need help the least. With such generosity for those doing the best, one would think the President would take care of those struggling the most. But that is not the case.

On the housing crisis, for example, the proposal we have put forward calls for five simple things. Transparency—if you are going to buy a home, have it so that people understand the terms of the deal. It is very simple. JACK REED pushed that. CDBG money to go to local governments to buy foreclosed properties. Local governments are crying for these moneys. Revenue bonds would allow the law to be changed. Instead of revenue bonds to buy new homes, you could buy foreclosed or used homes. And then the loss carryforward that is so important for the homebuilding industry—the money you have made in the past could be offset with the money that has been lost in recent years. Finally, the bankruptcy provision—we have talked a lot about it here—to allow people to have the bankruptcy court take a look at their loans and see if they can readjust the loans.

The President pays for his tax giveaways to the wealthy in part by proposing deep cuts to Medicare and Medicaid—that is a fact—while underfunding everything from terrorism prevention to veterans education. That is not just irresponsible fiscal policy. Many believe, as I met with a group of religious leaders last week, that it is immoral fiscal policy.

This week, we are proposing a budget that abandons Bush economics, lowers taxes for the middle class, creates new jobs, and turns our struggling economy around. This requires both immediate help and long-term solutions. In short, our budget calls for further steps to stimulate growth and address the housing crisis. It sets aside \$35 billion for measures such as extending unemployment insurance, providing home heating and nutrition assistance, and rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges. Everyone should know that for every billion dollars we spend in developing roads, bridges, dams, highways, water systems, sewer systems, we create 47,500 high-paying jobs. We help families avoid losing their homes in our budget to foreclosure, a measure that has been blocked by Republican filibuster.

For the long-term, our budget calls for meaningful investments in energy, education, and infrastructure. These investments will create jobs, provide Americans with new tools to succeed, increase productivity, improve our environment, and help ensure a strong and growing economy. These are not just wishes or dreams. We were able to accomplish that. The last years of the Clinton administration, we were spending less money than we were taking in. We were actually paying down the debt.

The budget we are working on this week also rejects the Bush administration's deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and will expand health care coverage for children. It would make America safer by embracing our troops and veterans and rejecting the administration's plan to underfund antiterrorism and anticrime initiatives.

In stark contrast to the President's continued fiscal irresponsibility, our budget would restore fiscal discipline. It would maintain strong pay-as-you-go rules, which were in effect in the Clinton years, which really worked. The budget would be fully balanced in 3 years.

Our bipartisan budget sets a path toward a stronger economic future. We can make it even stronger by passing an amendment that will be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS of Montana. Several colleagues will join in that. The Baucus amendment would use projected surpluses to cut taxes on the middle class—extending marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the 10-percent tax bracket. The amendment also reforms the estate tax to protect small businesses and family farms and includes other tax cuts as well.

Democrats believe in cutting taxes—not for chief executive officers of these big companies, not for oil men, but for middle-class families who need help the most.

Mr. President, I have already talked about the two men who are going to manage this bill: Chairman CONRAD and ranking member JUDD GREGG. They really do good work. Now it is up to the full Senate to follow Senator CONRAD's lead, and that of Senator JUDD GREGG, to move forward and get a budget that can be the blueprint for what we do the rest of this Congress.

I look forward to an open, productive budget debate this week. I hope that with the kind of steely resolve President Roosevelt showed, we can put the failed Bush economic policies behind us and pass a fair, responsible budget that makes America stronger, safer, and more prosperous.

PEACE CORPS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I had the good fortune to meet earlier today with the head of the Peace Corps. His name is Ron Tschetter—a wonderful man who was approved overwhelmingly not that long ago by the full Senate.

The Peace Corps is one of the programs that is so good for this country and the world. We have a little over 8,000 Peace Corps volunteers. We should have twice as many. The President said a couple years ago he was going to double the Peace Corps from 7,000 to 14,000. That has not happened. He has increased it by a few hundred, and that is very, very important. From Nevada, we have 22 Peace Corps volunteers out of the 8,000. They are from all over the world.

As I have had the good fortune of being able to travel as a representative of our country around the world over the last several decades, every place I go, I visit with Peace Corps volunteers because there is no group of individuals that does more for our country in setting good, high-quality standards than the Peace Corps volunteers. They do great work, and I am very proud of them.

These Peace Corps volunteers, when they are interviewed, are not Democrats or Republicans, they are Americans, and they do great public service. They are true public servants, and I am very proud of the work they have done and will continue to do throughout the world on behalf of America.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

BUDGET WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week our friends on the other side pulled back the curtain on their budget

proposal, and taxpayers all across America groaned. It really was not very pretty. The Democrats propose to increase discretionary spending above the \$1 trillion mark for the first time ever. To pay for it, they want to increase taxes by a lot—the largest tax hike in history.

The timing, of course, could not be worse. At a time when Americans are seeing record gas prices, falling home values, and higher health care and tuition costs, the other side sees higher taxes and more spending. Rather than offer a plan to address the concerns of the day, they offer a plan to make those costs harder to meet inside the limits of a family budget. At a time of heightened economic worry, our friends' plan for America is for families to keep less of their money and they insist that Government spend more.

The effect of all this on U.S. families would be crushing. Under the Democratic budget, the average American family would see their annual tax bill go up by \$2,300 a year. Nearly 20 million seniors would see their taxes go up by more than \$2,000 a year. And 8 million low-income workers would be added to the tax roles.

At a time of increased economic concern, Democrats want the average American family to have \$2,300 less for the family budget under their plan. That is enough money to pay for an entire year's worth of gas for two cars. It is about what the average American family with two kids spends on health care in 9 months. It is also enough to buy 8 months' worth of groceries.

The average American family would suffer a lot under this plan. Consider a family in Kentucky that is just starting to think about college for a new baby. If that family took the \$2,300 Democrats are asking for in new taxes and invested it each year in a tax-free college savings account, they would have nearly \$75,000 for college by the time that child was ready to attend school.

This budget is not the answer Americans have been looking for. It is a cliché. When faced with a challenge, Democrats always answer with a simple three-word response: tax and spend. And this year is certainly no different.

American families and their children are the ones who will lose out under this tax-and-spend plan. Democrats promise to pay for everything but make families pay instead. They promised middle-class tax relief last year but did nothing to enact it. They promise to reduce the debt but increase it instead. And they promise to address long-term entitlement spending but only make the problem worse with higher taxes and more spending.

Over the last 25 years, Republican economic policies have lifted tens of millions of working families into the middle class. We did it through lower taxes, controlled spending, and keeping our defenses strong. Democrats know these policies worked. That is why, as we began this Congress, many Demo-

crats assured voters they would not raise taxes on working-class and middle-class voters. Well, this budget certainly fell short of that mark.

The proposed tax hike the Democrats sent down last week is four times bigger than the one in 1993 that even President Clinton said was too big for Americans and, ultimately, even for him. How can Democrats think the American people will accept this one? Do they think Americans want to see the gains of the last 6 years washed away by a budget that reinstates every tax we have lowered or repealed over that period?

Budget week is always a clarifying time of year on Capitol Hill. What the other side's budget makes clear once again is that our friends on the other side are more concerned about growing the size and scope of Washington spending, while we want to grow the family's budget. At a time of great economic uncertainty, Americans expect more from Government than a \$1.2 trillion tax hike and billions of dollars in new spending.

This budget spends more than \$775 billion from the Social Security surplus. It increases gross debt by more than \$2 trillion. It increases the deficit by almost \$400 billion. And it completely ignores the question of where we are going to get the money to pay for \$66 trillion in promised entitlements—this despite the fact that the Democratic chairman of the Budget Committee has explicitly said we need to reform entitlement programs.

Republicans made a pledge last year to fight tax increases and to rein in spending. We stuck by that pledge last year. In these difficult economic times, we will certainly stick by it this year. With this budget, Democrats want to spend more from Washington and raise your taxes to pay for it. I, for one, will vote to allow families to keep more of what they earn so they can decide how to spend it.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CORPORAL GARY BRENT COLEMAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of a soldier who gave his life in defense of his country. CPL Gary Brent Coleman of Pikeville, KY, perished on November 21, 2003, in Balad, Iraq, when his vehicle overturned mid-chase during combat operations. He was 24 years old.

The memorial service for Corporal Coleman was so large it filled the auditorium of his alma mater, Pikeville High School. Brent, as he was known, had been a local hero for his prowess on the football field. He became an even greater hero by stepping forward in a time of war.

Friends, family members and fellow soldiers spoke, one after another, on the effect Brent had had in their lives. When it was over, Brent's father, Gary Keene Coleman, said, "I was . . . proud that Brent had made that type of an impact on so many people. But I would rather for him to be here."

For his bravery in uniform, Corporal Coleman received many medals, awards and decorations, including the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star Medal.

Brent was born in Pikeville, in eastern Kentucky, and spent the majority of his life in the area. From a young age he was not afraid to speak his mind. When Brent was about six or seven, he and his family went to the circus. They had lions there, and the lion tamer was directing them with his whip.

But young Brent thought the lion tamer was using the whip on the lions—and that despite their sharp claws and teeth, they needed a small boy to come to their aid. “Stop that right now!” he yelled to the lion tamer. The whole circus audience laughed at Brent’s display of compassion and bravery.

Brent loved sports, and grew up playing T-Ball, baseball, and football. Once when Brent and his cousin Ben were both 12 years old, Brent showed Ben how to hold the football close to his chest. Ben took the ball and ran, Brent tackled him, and I guess Ben was holding the ball a little too tightly—it broke his shoulder and his rib.

Gary took Brent and his brother, Jason, to the Super Bowl every year. Brent’s favorite team was the Detroit Lions, and star running back Barry Sanders was his role model. Brent, Gary, and Jason would fly to wherever the big game was and stay for the weekend; they never missed a Super Bowl.

Football was more than just a game to watch for Brent, it was his passion, and he excelled at it. At Pikeville High School, Brent was an all-county running back for the Pikeville Panthers. He was named offensive player of the year at the start of his senior year, in 1996, and he is still the leading rusher and scorer in the school’s history.

The Kentucky High School Athletic Association recognizes Brent for holding these records: 8th overall in career yards rushing, tenth overall in career touchdowns, and 11th overall in career points scored.

“Brent was idolized by the students and their parents,” says Eddie Coleman, Brent’s uncle. “He was a local hero before he was the real hero.”

With so much talent came an appropriate nickname. Brent’s teammates called him “Rocket,” because he could find a hole and plow right through it.

Footage from a local television station shows Brent earned yet another nickname—“Stumpy.” “I guess because I’m short and fat,” a grinning Brent said to the TV reporter.

“He didn’t lack for confidence,” his father Gary tells us. “Brent was someone with compassion, always trying to do good, always trying to do the right thing, and he had a competitive personality.”

Everyone around him could see Brent was special, and that did not change

when Brent joined the Army. After attending Marshall University in Huntington, WV, for 2 years, he enlisted on July 11, 2001, and underwent basic training at the U.S. Army Armor Center at Fort Knox, KY. He graduated Basic in the top five overall.

Brent was then assigned to Company B, 1st Battalion, 68th Armor Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, based out of Fort Carson, CO. Upon graduating basic training, he told his family, “I know I can make it on my own.”

Brent saw service to his country as a way of life. “He was going to make a career out of it, and I encouraged him to,” says Gary. Brent held several positions on the M1A1 Abrams tank, including gunner and loader, and he eventually became a tank commander.

Stationed in Colorado Springs, Brent met a special woman there, and Brent and Kirsten Sinley Coleman became husband and wife. They married in March, 3 weeks before Brent deployed to Iraq.

The star running back and tank commander who had already acquired a few nicknames soon picked up another from his fellow soldiers: “Hollywood.” I will let SSG Jason Gallegos, who served with Brent, explain why.

Brent “was about five-foot-five and weighed about 175 pounds,” Staff Sergeant Gallegos says. “His body was short in stature, but he was pure muscle with about maybe eight to nine percent body fat.”

“He looked like an action figure, a poster child of what a United States soldier looks like. . . . The reason behind the nickname was because Corporal Coleman worked out hard every day here for two to three hours a day.

“Then whenever he got the opportunity, he would go outside our bunker into the sun in just his PT shorts, place mirrors around him, put on his shades and throw on some music and tan. It was like he was a movie star.”

Brent was well liked by his fellow soldiers; and not just because of funny stories like these. He was liked and respected because he always gave his best, and encouraged others to do the same.

“He would always volunteer for the tough missions,” Staff Sergeant Gallegos says. “‘Be smart and be aggressive,’ he would say, because he felt if you’re passive then you not only endanger yourself, but also your soldiers. . . . He was there for anybody, no matter what platoon, what day of the week, or what time of day.”

At Brent’s funeral, his sergeant told the Coleman family, “Brent was 24 and they get a lot of 18-year-olds. Brent would always volunteer to take the young ones’ places to protect them.”

“He served his country. He never complained. He was made for the military, physically and mentally,” Brent’s father, Gary, says. “He said he had a job to do.”

Mr. President, I had the honor of meeting Gary Coleman in 2005, and I presented him with an American flag

flown over this Capitol. Neither that flag nor the words we say here today can make up for what the Coleman family has lost. But they are the very least we can do to honor Brent’s memory.

We are thinking today of Brent’s loved ones, including his wife Kirsten Sinley Coleman; his mother Janie Adkins Johnson; his father Gary Keene Coleman; his brother Jason Byron Coleman; his grandmother Ruby Coleman Damron; and many other family members and friends.

Mr. President, today, March 10, is Brent’s birthday. It is a day to celebrate Brent’s life, and I thought an appropriate day for me to speak on how he lived, and what he lived for.

To the Coleman family who have lost a husband, brother, and son, I want to say this: CPL Gary Brent Coleman left this world a hero. And on behalf of a grateful Nation, the U.S. Senate honors his life of sacrifice and service.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

AIR FORCE CONTRACT AWARD

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the last several days, we have learned some surprising things about the Air Force’s decision to award a \$40 billion contract to the European company, Airbus.

The Air Force wants Airbus, which is headquartered in Toulouse, France, to supply our next generation of aerial refueling tankers. It chose Airbus over the American company, Boeing, which has been making those tankers for the last 50 years.

I have made it clear over the past several days that I think this decision is shortsighted and dangerous. But today, even more questions have been raised about the process the Air Force followed to make this decision. So I want to take the opportunity this afternoon to walk through the impact I believe the Air Force decision will have because I think we need to take a good hard look at whether we as Members of the Senate think this contract should be finalized.

First, we need to be very cautious about any decision that awards the right to build a critical part of our military air technology to a company

that is controlled by a foreign government. What happens if that government disagrees with us on foreign policy? What if it decides it wants to slow down our military capacity? Do we want another country to have that kind of control?

The Air Force, of course, did not take that into consideration. They said they didn't have to. I think this case is a perfect example of how misguided that idea is.

Airbus is owned by the European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company—EADS—which in turn is controlled by several nations. Among them are countries which have not always agreed with the United States on foreign policy. They include Russia, which has a 5-percent stake, and the United Arab Emirates, which controls 7.5 percent of EADS.

Now, EADS has already demonstrated it is willing to bend the rules if it can help the company make money. I have talked extensively on the floor of the Senate about their attempts to sell military helicopters and planes to Iran and to Venezuela. But now we are opening the doors to a key piece of our military defense to them.

America's global military strength is built on our ability to use our military might anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. Aerial tankers are the linchpin of our air power because they allow the U.S. Air Force to stretch across the globe. Until now, the technology that powered these critical planes rested in the hands of Boeing and its American workforce that has been building them for more than 50 years.

Until now, our tankers have been built by manufacturers, designers, and engineers who are bound by law from selling technology to countries that sponsor terrorism. But as a result of this contract, we are allowing EADS to take over a cornerstone of our military technology, and we are actually paying them to do it. In fact, I argue that decision was a \$40 billion investment in the military research budget of EADS and Airbus.

The Air Force has said it wasn't their responsibility to take our security or our industry into account. Well, I say to my colleagues: Congress must—we must—be more forward-looking than that.

Secondly, I question why the Air Force was not required to take the economic impact into consideration when it awarded this contract. If Boeing had won this contract, it would have created 44,000 U.S. jobs. But it is far from clear what kind of an investment Airbus and its partner, Northrop Grumman, plan to make in the United States.

Our economy is hurting. We are nearing a recession, if we aren't already there. Families across the country are struggling to get by, in part because their factory jobs have been moved overseas. Workers across this country are frustrated, and they are angry that

at a time such as this, their Government is saying it wants to take American tax dollars—our tax dollars—and give that money to a foreign company to build planes for our military.

We have more reason for concern because for decades Europe provided subsidies, their subsidies, to prop up Airbus and EADS. Airbus, they have said, is a jobs program that has led to tens of thousands of layoffs in the United States, and EADS has made little secret of its desire to dismantle the American aerospace industry.

Our Government, in fact, is concerned enough about these practices that we now have a WTO case against the EU over this. Yet here we are, last week our Government awarded Airbus this \$40 billion contract anyway. That should give us a great deal of pause because EADS is already looking to build on the toehold that contract gives them into our aerospace industry.

In fact, a report in a leading French news service today says the executive president of EADS—Airbus—wants to build on the company's success with the tanker contract and propose to the EADS board “two takeover projects in the fields of defense, security, or services.”

And he said: “One of them at least should be in the United States.”

That brings me to my final point this afternoon. Why didn't the Air Force consider these obvious questions about national security and about economic security? Well, the Los Angeles Times today suggests an answer. They report on the front page of their paper today that EADS and its partner, Northrop Grumman, may have played a role in narrowing the scope of what the Air Force looked at. In fact, the Times reports that Northrop executives ensured that the Air Force wouldn't ask the competitors how Government subsidies would help pay for the design and development of the tanker—the subject of the very WTO dispute I just mentioned.

According to that article, Northrop made threats in order to shape the criteria the Air Force followed.

The Times reports:

Northrop threatened at one point to pull out of the competition if the Air Force didn't change the way the aircraft would be evaluated.

So did the Air Force pull a bait and switch with this contract? Did it unfairly change the process to benefit EADS?

I believe there are many serious questions about this selection process. As U.S. Senators, it is our job to consider the future of our national security and our defense. I believe we need open and honest answers to those questions before this contract is finalized. In fact, I think we ought to demand the answers. Our economy and our aerospace industry are suffering, and we are at war across the globe. We have to get this right. Our future depends on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about three issues that I think are vitally important for our national security. First, there is this matter of terrorist surveillance and our national security.

This body passed the bipartisan FISA Act bill overwhelmingly—more than 2 to 1—several days before the Protect America Act was to expire. The Director of National Intelligence has told us how important this bill is because without it, intelligence gaps likely will reopen, putting the safety of America—those of us in the United States—and our troops on the battlefield at risk. Yet the House Speaker refuses to allow a vote on the Senate's bill, even though a majority of House Members support its passage. If you vote, that means something. If you win, you win; if you lose, you lose. But the leadership in the House apparently thinks those rules don't apply to the FISA debate.

Even though the Speaker failed to pass a 21-day extension of the existing law in her own body, the leadership has acted as though the PAA deadline was extended. There has been no action.

So what is the House going to do this week? Well, the Speaker has signaled that the House will vote on overriding the President's veto of the 2008 intelligence authorization bill, even though she knows there are not enough votes to override the vote. Why? Because apparently, the House leadership has decided it is more important to make a political statement about interrogation techniques than to give the intelligence community the tools it needs to conduct surveillance of foreign intelligence.

The IC—the intelligence community—needs these tools and authorities that are provided in the bill we passed. They are working tirelessly to protect us from real and constant terrorist threats, and they should not have to wait any longer for the House to pass that measure.

Secondly, let me talk about Korea briefly. I just came from an Appropriations Defense Subcommittee hearing with General Bell, our commanding general in Korea. He told us that not just a brave new wind but a typhoon has blown through South Korea, and the previous government that was in many ways anti-American was totally willing to accommodate North Korea in all of its efforts, which included building missiles and nuclear weapons, and rebuff the United States.

Well, the people of Korea had enough, and they overwhelmingly elected a new President, President Lee Myung-bak, who ran on a platform of revitalizing the economy, making any actions with North Korea reciprocal, and improving their alliance with the U.S. position. The candidate who came in second agreed with him on these issues. The previous leadership candidate got single digits.

The most important things we can do are to increase our trade and our military assistance to South Korea. South

Korea is already our largest importer for military equipment, and they live in a very dangerous part of the world. They are right next door to China and close to bordering on Russia, just across the straits from Japan, and they are potentially—they have been and they will be our most important ally. But we have given higher foreign military sales status to three former Soviet Union States and five countries from the Warsaw Pact, none of which are as good friends as South Korea.

I have filed a bill, S. 1846, the United States-Republic of Korea Defense Cooperation and Improvement Act of 2007, that would give them the status of NATO plus 3, so we could continue to expand on our vital defense trade with them. He says this is his top priority. We are already cooperating with them. There is new cooperation. There is an opportunity to build an even stronger ally in the region to help keep that region safe, peaceful, and secure.

Secondarily, for Korea, we also need to approve the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement. Free trade is one of the best ways we have of assuring that other countries get the development they need, we can develop the friendship we have and improve our economy and theirs. A Korea-United States trade agreement would give lower tariff barriers, and get rid of many of them, to keep our agriculture, machine goods, and high-tech goods from going into South Korea. We need to do that.

But there are political objections. That brings me to the third important point: Colombia. Colombia has pending with the United States a United States-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. As I have just said, trade and commercial ties are one of the most effective arrows in our quiver of smart power. In Colombia, it is an affirmation of support to our friends. They are our strongest ally on an increasingly left-leaning continent—another area where they are our best friends in a dangerous area.

The administration of the President of Colombia, President Uribe, finds itself surrounded by states determined to undermine Colombia's burgeoning democracy. The states around them provide safe haven to insurgent terrorist groups, allowing them freedom to maneuver in border areas, and they even provide monetary support for drug and terror activities against President Uribe's government in Colombia. If we are serious, as we must be, about maintaining peace, security, and stability in Latin America, the northern part of Latin America, we must work with them.

Free trade will not only expand our economic and commercial ties, but it will strengthen the critical cultural ties and strategic alliances, and that will lead to a more peaceful and stable world.

At a time when America's image is suffering in the world and our economy at home is slumping, we should be

helping our friends and allies and expanding our export opportunities to create jobs here.

If the Democratic leadership in Congress is so concerned about improving America's image abroad and helping our slumping economy, why don't we start by helping our friends? We can do that by opening up markets for exports. Friends like Colombia and Korea are fighting terrorism, embracing America's values. It is a solid security rock for us to build upon.

In Colombia, the interdiction of two high-value targets—senior terror planners and former operators—is a testimony to the Uribe administration's commitment to ending terror in his country. It is important to remember that the terrorist group FARC currently holds more than 700 political and military prisoners. Three of them are Americans. Yet our Democratic colleagues, through all their rhetoric, seem to care more about improving our image with rogue regimes such as Syria and Iran than helping our friends in places such as Colombia and Korea. Their rejection of the free-trade agreements damages our strategic alliances and says to the world that the United States is closed for business. And it does so at a time when we need to be open for business, open for better ties.

So why, in light of the economic and strategic benefits of the Colombia FTA, are the Democrats determined to delay and deny these benefits? Why, through their actions, are they emboldening Venezuelan leftist Hugo Chavez and undercutting the President of Colombia, who is a friend? President Uribe has done more to reduce violence in Colombia than any modern leader in Bogota, including crimes against labor unionists. He has pushed back Marxist guerrillas of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, FARC, and the National Liberation Army, the ELN. He has reduced crime and substantially improved Colombia's security and economic situations, with official statistics showing murders plummeting by as much as 50 percent and kidnappings by as much as 75 percent.

Today's Wall Street Journal, which I will submit later, is entitled "Delaying and Denying." They sum it up like this:

What is it about Democrats and Hugo Chavez? Even as the Venezuelan strongman was threatening war last week against Colombia, Congress was threatening to hand him a huge strategic victory by spurning Colombia's free trade overtures to the U.S.

This isn't the first time Democrats have come to Mr. Chavez's aid, but it would be the most destructive. The Venezuelan is engaged in a high-stakes competition over the political and economic direction of Latin America. He wants the region to follow his path of ever greater state control of the economy, while assisting U.S. enemies wherever he can. He's already won converts in Bolivia and Ecuador, and he came far too close for American comfort in Mexico's election last year.

Meanwhile, Colombian President Alvaro Uribe is embracing greater economic and political freedom. He has bravely assisted the

U.S. fight against narco-traffickers, and he now wants to link his country more closely to America with a free trade accord. As a strategic matter, to reject Colombia's offer now would tell everyone in Latin America that it is far more dangerous to trust America than it is to trash it.

Mr. President, continuing to deny and delay Colombia TPA will be a great disadvantage to America's economy, damage our reputation in Colombia and throughout Latin America, undercut a key ally in President Uribe, and further embolden anti-American dictators like Hugo Chavez, ultimately resulting in a less secure and stable Latin America.

Mr. President, I call upon and urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to let us bring up for a vote and pass the Korean free-trade agreement and the Colombia free-trade agreement. Not only will that benefit us economically, it will strengthen the U.S. image throughout the world and help build a stable, strategic ally in Colombia that can stop the threat of more regimes committed to the Marxism that Cuba so famously demonstrated, which brought destruction and hardship to the people of Cuba.

These are important foreign policy matters. One leader in the majority on the other side of the body said: Well, politically, we cannot do it. Politically, we cannot help those who help us? Politically, we cannot pass a bill that will keep our country safer by passing the FISA bill? Politically, we cannot help an ally such as South Korea, which is in a very strategic position? And politically, we cannot help Colombia, which is fighting narcotraffickers as well as the efforts by Hugo Chavez for spreading a Marxist regime and the totalitarian government which impoverishes and denies rights to his citizens?

Mr. President, the time to act is now. I urge my colleagues on both sides to make these matters a serious concern and see if we can do the job for which we were elected—to help keep our country safe and secure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today, March 10, 2008, called "The Chavez Democrats" be printed in the RECORD, along with a similar and very compelling article on the op-ed page of the Washington Post, by Jackson Diehl, called "The FARC's Guardian Angel," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10, 2008]

THE CHAVEZ DEMOCRATS

What is it about Democrats and Hugo Chavez? Even as the Venezuelan strongman was threatening war last week against Colombia, Congress was threatening to hand him a huge strategic victory by spurning Colombia's free trade overtures to the U.S.

This isn't the first time Democrats have come to Mr. Chavez's aid, but it would be the most destructive. The Venezuelan is engaged in a high-stakes competition over the political and economic direction of Latin America. He wants the region to follow his path of

ever greater state control of the economy, while assisting U.S. enemies wherever he can. He's already won converts in Bolivia and Ecuador, and he came far too close for American comfort in Mexico's election last year.

Meanwhile, Colombian President Álvaro Uribe is embracing greater economic and political freedom. He has bravely assisted the U.S. fight against narco-traffickers, and he now wants to link his country more closely to America with a free-trade accord. As a strategic matter, to reject Colombia's offer now would tell everyone in Latin America that it is far more dangerous to trust America than it is to trash it.

Yet Democrats on Capitol Hill are doing their best to help Mr. Chávez prevail against Mr. Uribe. Even as Mr. Chávez was doing his war dance, Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus was warning the White House not to send the Colombia deal to the Hill for a vote without the permission of Democratic leaders. He was seconded by Ways and Means Chairman Charlie Rangel, who told Congress Daily that "they don't have the votes for it, it's not going to come on the floor," adding that "what they [the White House] don't understand it's not the facts on the ground, it's the politics that's in the air."

Mr. Rangel is right about the politics. No matter what U.S. strategic interests may be in Colombia, this is an election year in America. And Democrats don't want to upset their union and anti-trade allies. The problem is that the time available to pass anything this year is growing short. The closer the election gets, the more leverage protectionists have to run out the clock on the Bush Presidency. The deal has the support of a bipartisan majority in the Senate, and probably also in the House. Sooner or later the White House will have to force the issue.

Our guess is that Messrs. Baucus and Rangel understand the stakes and privately favor the accord. The bottleneck is Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who is refusing to allow a vote under pressure from her left-wing Members. These Democrats deride any link between Hugo Chávez and trade as a "scare tactic," as if greater economic prosperity had no political consequences. "President Bush's recent fear-mongering on trade shows just how desperate he is to deliver one final victory for multinational corporations," declared Illinois Democrat Phil Hare, who is one of Ms. Pelosi's main trade policy deputies.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 2008]

THE FARC'S GUARDIAN ANGEL

(By Jackson Diehl)

Latin American nations and the Bush administration spent the past week loudly arguing over what censure, if any, Colombia should face for a bombing raid that killed one of the top leaders of the FARC terrorist group at a jungle camp in Ecuador. More quietly, they are just beginning to consider a far more serious and potentially explosive question: What to do about the revelation that Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez forged a strategic alliance with the FARC aimed at Colombia's democratic government.

First reports of the documents recovered from laptops at the FARC camp spoke of promises by Chávez to deliver up to \$300 million to a group renowned for kidnapping, drug trafficking and massacres of civilians; they also showed that Ecuadoran President Rafael Correa was prepared to remove from his own army officers who objected to the FARC's Ecuadoran bases.

But in their totality, the hundreds of pages of documents so far made public by Colombia paint an even more chilling picture. The raid appears to have preempted a breathtakingly

ambitious "strategic plan" agreed on by Chávez and the FARC with the initial goal of gaining international recognition for a movement designated a terrorist organization by both the United States and Europe. Chávez then intended to force Colombian President Álvaro Uribe to negotiate a political settlement with the FARC, and to promote a candidate allied with Chávez and the FARC to take power from Uribe.

All this is laid out in a series of three e-mails sent in February to the FARC's top leaders by Iván Márquez and Rodrigo Granda, envoys who held a series of secret meetings with Chávez. Judging from the memos, Chávez did most of the talking: He outlines a five-stage plan for undermining Uribe's government, beginning with the release of several of the scores of hostages the FARC is holding.

The first e-mail, dated Feb. 8, discusses the money: It says that Chávez, whom they call "angel," "has the first 50 [million] available and has a plan to get us the remaining 200 in the course of the year." Chávez proposed sending the first "packet" of money "through the black market in order to avoid problems." He said more could be arranged by giving the FARC a quota of petroleum to sell abroad or gasoline to retail in Colombia or Venezuela.

Chávez then got to the plans that most interested him. He wanted the FARC to propose collecting all of its hostages in the open, possibly in Venezuela, for a proposed exchange for 500 FARC prisoners in Colombian jails. Chávez said he would travel to the area for a meeting with the FARC's top leader, Manuel Marulanda, and said the presidents of Ecuador, Nicaragua and Bolivia would accompany him. Meanwhile, Chávez said he would set up a new diplomatic group, composed of those countries and the FARC, plus Mexico, Brazil and Argentina, for the purpose of recognizing the FARC as a legitimate "belligerent" in Colombia and forcing Uribe into releasing its prisoners.

In "the early morning hours," the FARC envoys recounted in a Feb. 9 e-mail, Chávez reached the subject of whether the release of Ingrid Betancourt, a former Colombian presidential candidate who is the FARC's best-known hostage, would complicate his plan to back a pro-FARC alternative to Uribe. "He invites the FARC to participate in a few sessions of analysis he has laid out for following the Colombian political situation," the e-mail concluded.

Assuming these documents are authentic—and it's hard to believe that the cerebral and calculating Uribe would knowingly hand over forgeries to the world media and the Organization of American States—both the Bush administration and Latin American governments will have fateful decisions to make about Chávez. His reported actions are, first of all, a violation of UN Security Council Resolution 1373, passed in September 2001, which prohibits all states from providing financing or havens to terrorist organizations. More directly, the Colombian evidence would be more than enough to justify a State Department decision to cite Venezuela as a state sponsor of terrorism. Once cited, Venezuela would be subject to a number of automatic sanctions, some of which could complicate its continuing export of oil to the United States. A cutoff would temporarily inconvenience Americans—and cripple Venezuela, which could have trouble selling its heavy oil in other markets.

For now, the Bush administration appears anxious to avoid this kind of confrontation. U.S. intelligence agencies are analyzing the Colombian evidence; officials say they will share any conclusions with key Latin American governments. Yet those governments have mostly shrunk from confronting Chávez

in the past, and some have quietly urged Bush to take him on. If the president decides to ignore clear evidence that Venezuela has funded and conspired with an officially designated terrorist organization, he will flout what has been his first principle since Sept. 11, 2001.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the concurrent budget resolution, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would like to be informed when I have used 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will so inform the Senator.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we come to the floor with a budget resolution that came out of the committee last week. I think it is important to set the stage in recognition of the fiscal condition of the country as we present this budget.

We have seen a dramatic deterioration in the budget situation under this President. As we all know, he inherited a budget that was in surplus; in fact, a budget that was estimated to have a future of surpluses so large that the head of the Federal Reserve said we were in danger of paying off the Federal debt. That is a danger I would like to have.

The President then took us on a fiscal course that has produced four of the five largest deficits in our history. In fact, it may turn out to be five of the largest deficits in our history, depending on how events unfold this year.

We can see in the previous years we were having budget surpluses, and then the President took us into deficit and deepened those deficits until we reached a record deficit in 2004 of \$413

billion. Now we see those levels being challenged in this year and perhaps next as well.

The result of these massive deficits is this President has built a wall of debt that is unprecedented. When President Bush came into office in 2000, the debt at the end of his first year—we do not hold him responsible for his first year because he is working on the budget he inherited—the debt stood at \$5.8 trillion. At the end of last year, the debt had reached over \$9 trillion. And by the end of 2009, which will be for the 8 years for which he is responsible, we will see the debt will have risen to over \$10 trillion. This President will almost have doubled the debt of the United States in just 8 years.

Not only will he have almost doubled the debt of the country, the gross debt, all of the money we owe, but he will also have more than doubled what we owe to foreign nations. It took 42 Presidents, all the Presidents pictured here, 224 years to run up a \$1 trillion of U.S. debt held abroad. This President has more than doubled that amount—much more than doubled that amount—in just 7 years. The result of that is we now owe Japan almost \$600 billion. We owe China almost \$500 billion. We owe the United Kingdom over \$150 billion. We owe the oil exporters almost \$140 billion, and so it goes.

That is a warning sign to all of us about the fiscal condition of our country. The long-term projections are sobering as well. Partly as a result of this tremendous buildup of debt, the value of the dollar has shrunk rather dramatically. This chart shows the dollar against the Euro. It has gone down 40 percent since 2002. Anybody who has traveled has seen that in what they buy abroad. We see it in the prices of goods that are being imported. We also see it in terms of the kinds of reactions we are getting in the marketplace to further American indebtedness. We are hearing warnings from people who are saying: United States, you have to get your fiscal house in order. You cannot keep running up these massive debts and deficits.

We see that during this period of the Bush administration that economic growth has lagged previous recoveries. We have gone back and looked at all of the major recoveries since World War II. There have been nine previous recoveries. At the same point in the business cycle, the economy had typically grown at an average pace of 3.4 percent a year during those previous recoveries.

Look at what is happening here. In this recovery, the average GDP growth is only 2.5 percent, well short of what we have seen at the same point in previous economic cycles.

Now we have a new element to consider, and that is a housing slump with new home building falling dramatically. We have seen this pattern which comes to us from the Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. This is monthly data through January 2008.

These are housing starts in millions of units, and we can see that housing starts have plunged, and plunged dramatically. We also have word that inventories of unsold homes are growing, and growing dramatically; that foreclosures are running at a very alarming rate. And all of this signals trouble in the economy.

There are other indicators as well. If we look at business investment in this economic period versus what we have seen in the nine previous recoveries since World War II, that growth of business investment is lagging in this business cycle by 52 percent. That should tell us there is something amiss in the economic policy of this administration. Something is not working. Certainly by comparison with previous business cycles, the nine significant business cycles since World War II, this one is showing much more weakness than the previous nine.

That is also true in job creation. If we look at the nine previous business cycles—that is the dotted red line on this chart, and this business cycle is the black line—we are now 9.6 million private sector jobs short of the typical business cycle, going all the way back to World War II.

There are a lot of alarm bells that are ringing, warning signs to which we need to pay attention and need to respond to in a budget. We have seen real median household income decline by almost \$1,000 under President Bush, from \$49,163 in 2000 to just over \$48,000 in 2006, the last year for which we have complete statistics.

Mr. President, these numbers cry out for a response. And the first way that we respond is in a budget because the budget sets the policy priorities for the coming year. And we have attempted to do that in this budget by emphasizing strengthening the economy and creating jobs by doing the following: investing in energy, education, and infrastructure.

Those are the top three priorities to help strengthen the economy. Invest in energy. Why? To reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We are now spending \$1 billion a day buying foreign oil. How much better off would our country be, how much stronger would the economy be if we were generating our own energy rather than importing it from around the world?

So part of this budget is designed to reduce our dependence on foreign energy and to strengthen our education and our job training because if we are not the best educated and best trained, we are not going to command the strongest economy for very long.

Also, to build our infrastructure. We all remember the incredible sight of the 35-W bridge collapsing last year. I think we all recognize that our airports, our rail lines, our highways and bridges need serious investment if we are going to be competitive globally.

We also need to expand health coverage for our children, provide tax cuts for the middle class, and restore fiscal

responsibility by balancing the budget in 4 years and maintaining balance in the fifth.

Mr. President, we also want to make America safer by supporting the troops, by providing for veterans health care, by protecting the homeland, and rejecting the President's cuts in law enforcement. For example, he eliminates the COPS Program. He cuts first responders' grants by 78 percent. We don't think that makes sense, and we reject those cuts in this budget.

Mr. President, we now anticipate that economic growth is going to slow sharply in this year. We can see it all around us—more job layoffs announced today, dramatic slowing of the economy. Economists today are saying they believe our country is already in recession. Of course, we will not know for several months, but it has all the appearance of a reduction in economic growth. The Congressional Budget Office is forecasting for this year an economic growth of only 1.6 percent, down from the 2.5 percent pace over the course of 2007 and 2.6 percent in 2006.

And, by the way, these were already weak economic growth numbers. 2006 was weak, 2007 was weak, and CBO is expecting even weaker growth in 2008. So in this budget resolution we provide for a second stimulus package. We have already had one stimulus package to try to increase aggregate demand in the economy, to give a lift. We believe it is prudent to provide the room in the budget for a second stimulus package, some \$35 billion of standby authority, so if this economy does continue to shed jobs and to weaken that we are prepared to respond and prepared to respond in these ways:

Housing relief. We have legislation on the floor now to provide relief for what is happening in the housing market. That package is a \$16 billion or \$17 billion package that could be accommodated in this \$35 billion of standby stimulus relief.

Also, we may need to extend unemployment insurance and provide for additional funding for food stamps or perhaps State fiscal relief. We know 21 of the States are increasingly in difficult financial straits, so we may need to extend some relief to them.

This budget also provides room for additional funding for low-income heating assistance and the WIC Program, the women, infant, and children's feeding program, and/or infrastructure spending in 2008.

When we did the last stimulus program, we asked the agencies of the Government if they had construction projects that were ready to go—where the engineering has been done, the design has been done, the land acquisition is finished—and all they need is money to begin construction and to begin hiring people. And they told us, yes, they do have projects like that. So we have provided for taking up some of those projects as part of the stimulus package.

Why? Because we know in road building, highway construction, and bridge

construction that for every \$1 billion, there are about 45,000 jobs created. And, Mr. President, we think it is very important that standby authority be ready to go if indeed this economy weakens further.

We also provide for tax relief in this budget resolution: the alternative minimum tax. If something is not done, it will affect 20 million more American families this year—the alternative minimum tax. So we provide an additional year's relief from that levy.

We also provide the energy tax incentives necessary to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, education tax incentives to make college more affordable for American families, and we provide the stimulus package, where I previously described some of the provisions, and they help the housing industry. Our tax provisions would fit in that \$35 billion package; for example, extending net operating loss provisions to home building companies so they aren't buffeted by further write-downs of their assets at the worst possible time.

And, of course, the important tax extenders, those permanent provisions that are about to expire that provide for the research and development credit, the wind energy credit, and the like, those are provided for in this budget resolution as well.

The first amendment that will be offered to this budget will be to extend the middle-class tax provisions previously enacted. Those provisions are about to expire, and we want to extend them. Those are the marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the 10-percent bracket. There is room in this budget to extend them all and still balance the budget in 4 years.

There is also room in this budget for estate tax reform along the lines of what we advocated last year. As you know, we faced this unusual situation where the exemption per person, the \$3.5 million next year but the year after, in 2010, there will be no estate tax. In 2011, the estate tax comes back with only \$1 million per person exemptions. So we provide the continuation of the \$3.5 million exemption per person and have that indexed for inflation.

Mr. President, there is not an American family who doesn't know what is happening to gas prices. I was just talking to my staff this morning about what they are experiencing. One of my staff—who was caught up in a horrendous traffic jam yesterday coming from Baltimore and took 2½ hours to get here—filled up, and it cost \$3.18 a gallon. I filled up the other day, and it was over \$3.20 a gallon. There are some projections now that gas is going to go to \$4 a gallon. Look what is happening just since 2001 when gas was less than \$1.50. It has more than doubled in just those 7 years, and we see it continuing to jump. I am told oil prices today are also rising on world markets. There was some speculation that oil might reach \$108 a barrel today on the world market.

So to address this continuing problem of energy dependence, we are proposing in this budget to invest in energy, to create green jobs, to reduce our dependence on foreign energy, to strengthen our economy, and to help with high home heating costs. We have to do that a package of energy tax incentives of over \$13 billion, \$3.5 billion over the President's budget in discretionary funding for energy, and an energy reserve fund for investing in clean energy and the environment.

We all know there are global climate change initiatives coming before Congress. If any of those are adopted, we are going to need a reserve fund like this to prepare for it.

Education is also a great challenge to us. We see from the National Science Foundation a chart that compares what is happening to bachelor's degrees in engineering in the thousands in China versus what is happening here. You can see we are pretty well flat, with about 75,000 engineers a year being produced. But look what has happened in China. China is now up to a rate of producing more than 350,000 engineers a year. That should serve as another alarm to us because we know engineering is critical to economic growth. And if you are producing many more engineers, you are laying the foundation for stronger economic growth in the years ahead.

I chose that as just one example. We know there are many others where we face global competition for doing the best job of educating our young people. So this budget resolution invests in education. It does it to generate economic growth and jobs, to prepare the workforce to compete in the global economy, and to make college more affordable and to improve student achievement.

We seek to do that by providing some \$13 billion in education tax cuts, some \$5.7 billion in funding over the President's budget in discretionary money for the Department of Education and Head Start, and a \$2 billion education reserve fund for school construction and higher education reauthorization.

But it doesn't end with energy and education, Mr. President. It also extends to the challenges in infrastructure. We all remember this very striking picture from last year when the bridge on 35-W collapsed between Minneapolis and St. Paul. That is a bridge I traveled over many times when my wife was in medical school at the University of Minnesota, and I think all of us, our hearts went out to those people. Imagine the horror of driving home from work and having the bridge fall out from under you. We know there were lives lost and people injured. That should not happen. That should not happen anywhere in America. It shouldn't happen anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, we know there are deficiencies in the infrastructure funding for highways, for bridges, for airports, and for rail, and all of those are going

to have to be strengthened and improved. This budget begins the process. It begins the process by creating a reserve fund to allow for major infrastructure legislation.

We have had a group of the country's business leaders come to us and tell us they have a plan they think could generate a multiplier effect in terms of matching public sector investment with private sector investment to build infrastructure in this country. We have created a reserve fund to allow for the adoption of such legislation if the committees of jurisdiction proceed, and if they pay for it, if they provide offsets for it.

We also provide \$3.9 billion more than the President for key discretionary transportation accounts in 2009, and we provide another \$6.5 billion to fully fund highways, fully fund transit, increase funding for airport improvement, and fund ready-to-go infrastructure projects.

Those are projects that are ready to be built; they only lack the money. We also fix the highway trust fund shortfall that exists. I think that is roughly \$1.4 billion that needs to be dealt with.

We not only have challenges and opportunities in education and energy and infrastructure, but we also have them in health care. We can see the number of uninsured children in our country has jumped by 700,000 just in the year 2006. We went from 8.7 million uninsured children to 9.4 million. So this budget seeks to make wise and careful investment there to improve health care, to expand coverage, to increase health research, and to promote food and drug safety. We do that by again providing for a reserve fund that will allow the \$35 billion children's health insurance compromise that was adopted last year but vetoed by the President to once again proceed this year.

We also provided \$4.4 billion over the President's budget in discretionary funding for health and a reserve fund to address the cut in Medicare physician payments and make other improvements to Medicare. We know the doctors of the country are scheduled for a very sharp cut in Medicare payments. I think that is rejected here virtually universally. But we have to do something about it. We provided a reserve fund to address that, so later this year Congress will be able to act.

The budget resolution also provides \$3.2 billion above the President's for our veterans. We know that veterans funding in the President's budget is \$44.9 billion. We have provided \$48.2 billion in funding for our veterans. This is focused on veteran health care, primarily in terms of veterans because we all recognize that is an area in which we simply must do better if we are going to keep the commitment that was made to our veterans.

In terms of war funding and defense funding, we match the President's request. He has asked for \$2.9 trillion over the next 5 years, and we matched

that amount in this budget—\$2.9 trillion.

The budget also provides \$2.3 billion more than the President's budget for law enforcement and first responders. This is an area which I find utterly inexplicable in the President's budget. President Bush sent this Congress a budget that eliminates the COPS Program—eliminated it. He did not just cut it, he eliminated it. The COPS Program has put 100,000 police officers on the streets in this country, put over 250 police officers on the street in my State of North Dakota. Why the President would eliminate the COPS Program eludes me.

He has also proposed cutting the first responder grants; that is for emergency medical personnel, that is for our firefighters and our other first responders. He has proposed cutting these grants 78 percent. We have rejected those cuts in this budget at a cost of \$2.3 billion.

While we have restored funding in certain key priority areas and made targeted investments in reducing our energy dependence and promoting education and in building our infrastructure, we have also sought to be fiscally responsible by balancing the budget by the fourth year and maintaining balance in the fifth.

Those are the numbers that are in the budget resolution, but this is before we extend the middle-class tax cuts. When we extend the middle-class tax cuts, these numbers will drop dramatically, but we will still be in surplus, we will still be balancing by 2012, by the fourth year, and be maintaining balance in the fifth. But we do think it is critically important to extend the middle-class tax cuts and to reform the estate tax, which previous legislation has left in a chaotic state, I think would be a fair way to say it.

We also, under this budget resolution, bring down the debt as a share of gross domestic product each and every year. Again, this is before the amendment to extend the middle-class tax cuts, but you will see the same pattern after we extend the middle-class tax cuts—the debt as a share of GDP going down each and every year of the 5 years—because we think that is critically important for the long-term economic health of the country.

This is a comparison of spending under the resolution and the President's budget. The red line is the President's spending line, the green line is ours. You can see there is very little difference. That is a difference of 2.1 percent in overall spending over the 5 years. So we do have some additional spending to meet these priorities in education and energy and infrastructure and reducing the cuts the President proposed for law enforcement, weatherization, and other priorities.

Spending as a share of GDP under the resolution goes down each and every year, from 20.8 percent of GDP in 2009 to 19 percent of GDP in 2013, applying the spending discipline that I think is necessary, that I think most of us

would say is necessary if we are going to address these problems of deficit and debt. The first thing we have to do is bring down the deficit, and this budget seeks to do that.

We also, for this year, for 2009—this shows the overall spending difference for this year. I have showed the spending comparison for 5 years showing that we are spending 2.2 percent more, but I think it is also important to look at 2009, the first year of this 5-year budget, on overall spending. We are spending 1 percent more than the President—1 percent more.

Some say: Well, you should not spend more than the President did. But the problem is, he had cuts that I do not think are broadly embraced by the American people. I do not think they think we should eliminate the COPS Program. I do not think they think we should eliminate weatherization. I do not think they believe we should cut the grants to first responders, our emergency personnel, by 78 percent. I do not think the American people think we should fail to invest in reducing our dependence on foreign energy. I do not think that is what the American people want. I do not think they believe we should continue to dramatically underfund infrastructure, which leads to bridges collapsing in our country. So we have spent more than the President—in total for 2009, 1 percent more. That 1 percent will go to those high-priority areas of energy, education, and infrastructure.

On the revenue side, this is the comparison when the middle-class tax cuts are extended. We will have 2.6 percent more revenue than in the President's budget—2.6 percent more revenue than in the President's budget.

Now, this shows that difference in revenue. The President's budget has \$15.2 trillion over the 5 years, and our budget is \$15.6 trillion—a 2.6-percent difference. Because we have more revenue, of course, we have the ability to fund in those high-priority areas but still balance the budget in the fourth year and maintain balance in the fifth. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget does balance in the fourth year but then promptly falls back out of balance in the fifth year. Our budget not only balances by the fourth year but stays in balance in the fifth.

Now, this is where we get into the question of, Well, how do you come up with 2.6 percent more revenue than the President has? I believe you can come up with the 2.6-percent more revenue than the President has by looking at three areas: the tax gap—that is the difference between what is owed and what is paid. The Internal Revenue Service tells us that for 2001 the tax gap was over \$300 billion; that is, the vast majority of us pay what we owe, but some do not. Before we ask for a tax increase from anyone, I think we ought to go to those who are not paying what they owe. Now, I think that is the first thing we ought to do before we ask for a tax increase from anyone.

But it is not just the tax gap, it is also those offshore tax havens that are proliferating and costing us a lot of money. There is a report from the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from February of last year. This is what they said:

Experts have estimated that the total loss to the Treasury from offshore tax evasion alone approaches \$100 billion per year, including \$40 to \$70 billion from individuals and another \$30 billion from corporations engaging in offshore tax evasion. Abusive tax shelters add tens of billions of dollars more.

Shame on us for allowing this kind of abuse to occur. Let me say, there have been some in this Chamber who have made a serious effort to close this kind of scam down, and I would be the first to recognize the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, who has been very serious about going after not only abusive tax shelters but offshore tax havens.

Here is an example of what is going on. There is a little five-story building in the Cayman Islands called Ugland House, a nice little building; 12,748 companies call it home. Mr. President, 12,748 companies say they are doing business out of this little five-story building. Can you imagine having 12,000 companies conducting business out of that little building? Of course they are not conducting business; the only business they are conducting is monkey business because what they are doing is cheating all of the rest of us who pay our taxes. They are engaged in very ambitious tax scams and tax schemes to avoid paying what they owe in this country.

Here is a picture of a building that was in the Boston Globe. Let's put up the Boston Globe story. This was a building that is also in the Cayman Islands where shell companies allowed KBR to avoid Medicare and Social Security deductions.

This story says:

Kellogg, Brown and Root, the nation's top Iraq war contractor, and until last year a subsidiary of Halliburton, has avoided paying hundreds of millions of dollars in Medicare and Social Security taxes by hiring workers through shell companies based in this tropical tax haven.

So what they were doing is hiring people paid for by American taxpayers, hiring them for contracts, and they were running them through these shell operations down in the Cayman Islands, and by doing that they were avoiding paying their Medicare and Social Security taxes to this country and saved hundreds of millions of dollars, according to this story in the Boston Globe from March 6 of this year. This is just days ago that this story appeared.

They point out:

More than 21,000 people working for KBR in Iraq, including 10,000 Americans, are listed as employees of two companies that exist in a computer file on the fourth floor of a building on a palm-studded boulevard here in the Caribbean. Neither company has an office or phone number in the Cayman Islands.

They do not even have a phone number. They do not even have a real office. What they have is a scam. This is the kind of scam we ought to shut down.

Here is the building, a very nice building. On the fourth floor of this building, apparently 21,000 people are supposedly employed, at least for the purpose of records.

Now, it does not stop there. This is a story from late last month in the *New York Times*:

U.S. among countries investigating tax evasion.

This is in Liechtenstein. I have never been to Liechtenstein. I am sure it is a lovely place. But the Internal Revenue Service says:

It was beginning enforcement action against more than 100 U.S. taxpayers on suspicion of evading taxes through investments in Liechtenstein.

They have the Deputy Director of the Center for Tax Policy and Administration at the OECD saying Liechtenstein is the tip of the iceberg. Indeed, it is.

This kind of scam is going on down in the Cayman Islands, going on in Liechtenstein, going on in other tax haven places, but it is also happening with abusive tax shelters. Last year, I showed pictures of European sewer systems. People might ask: What does a European sewer system have to do with revenue in the United States? It turns out it has a lot to do with it because it turns out U.S. companies are buying European sewer systems. Later on in this debate I will show a picture of one of those. It may not be the most welcome picture on the Senate floor, of a European sewer system, but, nonetheless, this is part of an incredible scam that is going on in which U.S. companies buy European sewer systems, write them off on their books in the United States for tax purposes, and lease them back to the European cities that built them in the first place. That should not be allowed. That is not fair to the rest of us who pay what we owe.

Last year, when we went after some of these scams, the President threatened a veto. He said that would be a tax increase. I guess it would be a tax increase on those who are getting away without paying what they fairly owe, but I don't consider it a tax increase to make people pay what they already owe. I don't consider it a tax increase to shut down a tax scam. I don't consider it a tax increase to shut down these abusive tax shelters.

We tried to codify economic substance, prohibiting transactions with no economic rationale, done solely to evade taxes. We tried to shut down schemes to lease foreign subway and sewer systems and depreciate assets. We tried to end deferral of offshore compensation by hedge fund managers trying to evade current taxation. We tried to expand broker reporting. We tried to tax people who use expatriation to evade taxes. Over and over the President said: No, I will have to veto because that would be a tax increase.

I think the President has it entirely wrong. Those are not tax increases. Those are just making those folks pay what the rest of us are already paying.

In this budget we provide a number of enforcement mechanisms to try to help restore some fiscal discipline. We have discretionary caps for 2008 and 2009. We maintain a strong pay-go rule. We have a point of order against long-term deficit increases. We allow reconciliation for deficit reduction only, and we have a point of order against mandatory spending on an appropriations bill. These are important enforcement mechanisms that ought to be part of any budget resolution. They are part of ours. I hope they are adopted by my colleagues.

Finally, this budget resolution has provisions addressing long-term challenges. More daunting than any of our short-term problems is where this is all headed. We can't pay our bills now; that is, before the baby boomers retire. What is going to happen then? What is going to happen to the commitments that have been made in Social Security and Medicare? What is going to happen with this tremendous imbalance between spending and revenue? We have offered these three elements as part of an approach, understanding that the larger plan to deal with our fiscal problems is going to have to come in some sort of special process, a process that Senator GREGG and I have offered our colleagues to create a task force with 16 Members—eight Democrats, eight Republicans—and ask them to come back with a plan as to how to deal with long-term imbalances.

In this resolution, we have comparative effectiveness reserve fund and cap adjustment to deal with health care. One of the things we know is that lots of different health modalities are being used across the country to address illness. Some of them work and some don't. We have to know which ones work.

Second, we have program integrity initiatives to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse in Social Security and Medicare. In fact, I received a letter from the Secretary of Health, Secretary Leavitt, thanking us for the program integrity funds that we have included so that he can continue his important investigations to shut down these Medicare fraud operations that he found in Florida and other parts of the country last year and that he is continuing to crackdown on.

He found a circumstance in which you go to these strip malls, and half of the offices in the strip malls are front organizations collecting Medicare payments. You go to the door and nobody is there during the day, during work time. They are just billing mills. They are sending out Medicare bills. Goodness knows if any service is actually being extended or not. But these are scams that are operating that need to be shut down.

We also have a point of order against long-term deficit increases which is

important to any strategy to contain burgeoning deficits and debt.

Before yielding the floor, I want to ask our colleagues for their cooperation. This is going to be an especially challenging budget. The numbers are very close on the two sides. We have two Presidential candidates on this side. They have a Presidential candidate on the other side. We know they may not be here for all of the deliberations. That means we are going to have to coordinate and cooperate. We also have a Member on our side who is ill. That means we will have a special challenge getting the budget done this year, but we must do it. We must get it done. I will be asking for all of our colleagues' cooperation as we proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the chairman spoke about his budget. For Senator GREGG, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I would like to start this debate on the Republican side. Since we are on the budget resolution, Senator GREGG would usually open debate for our side of the aisle. He wanted to take the lead today but has a necessary conflict in his schedule. He asked me to substitute, and I am pleased to do so. Senator GREGG will be here tomorrow to give what is normally the opening statement by the senior member of the Budget Committee on the Republican side.

I am going to first talk about the process and recent history of the Senate budget resolutions. Almost all of the revenue side of the budget is Finance Committee jurisdiction. Most of the spending side of the budget is also Finance Committee jurisdiction. For those of us who sit on the Finance Committee, we need to pay very careful attention to the budget. Chairman CONRAD, along with Senator WYDEN of Oregon and Senator STABENOW of Michigan, are all Finance Committee Democrats. This Senator, along with Senators BUNNING, CRAPO, and ENSIGN are all Finance Committee Republicans.

When I was Finance chairman for part of the year 2001 and all of the years 2003 through 2006, there was coordination regarding the fiscal resources and fiscal demands on the Finance Committee. That coordination occurred with respect to revenue levels, spending levels, and reconciliation instructions. Did we always agree over those years? The answer is no. Did we compromise when we had disagreements? The answer is most often yes. We did have some different priorities, but we worked through those differences during this committee's budget process. We came up with compromises that largely held together. I might add, those compromises and the levels regarding revenue spending and reconciliation instructions were in sync with the administration. My point is that we hashed out the fiscal differences in the Budget Committee and

on the Senate floor. The committee and floor debate, amendment votes, both pro and con, made a very real difference. The product of that process, the budget resolution that we will vote on as the last vote probably this week, the product made a real difference.

Those budget resolutions, though not perfect, provided me, while I was chairman of the Finance Committee, with the budget resources to deal with the policy demands on the Finance Committee. Most often, I used these resources to guide the Finance Committee, usually in a bipartisan manner, to deal with short-term, midterm, and even long-term problems. Last year was different. After the people spoke in the November 2006 elections, control of the Senate changed from Republican to Democrat, and the budget resolution was basically a Democratic resolution.

This year we see some repetition of last year's dramatically different fiscal path. As with the rest of the Budget Committee Republicans, I learned about this resolution for the first time when the chairman of the Budget Committee put the markup document before the committee. Committee Democrats were consulted extensively, along with the Democratic caucus. Most of the Republicans' knowledge prior to markup was derived from what we read in the press. I don't say this to be critical of the Democratic leadership. It is unfortunate but perhaps necessary that budgets are usually partisan documents. So I would say, with all due respect to the chairman, the chairman's mark was developed exclusively by Democrats in a partisan fashion.

Republicans, during committee markup, used that markup to educate ourselves, others on the other side, and the public. We asked questions. I pursued questions about how this budget deals with the resources and demands that fall on Senator BAUCUS and me in our respective roles as chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee. We offered a relatively small number of amendments. Most were defeated; some accepted.

On reforming farm program payment limits, I am pleased to say Senator ALLARD's amendment prevailed on a roll-call vote. That amendment improved this resolution, though not enough to gain the support of Senator ALLARD, this Senator, or any other Republicans.

Before I discuss the substance of the budget, I want to start off by complementing the chairman of the committee and his staff. They conducted the markup in a professional manner. The Democratic and Republican members have sharp, well-intentioned reasons for coming down in different places on the budget resolution. We were able to debate those differences in a full and fair manner.

I know if Senator GREGG were here speaking today, he would make these points as well. We are at the Senate floor stage of the budget on process. What I would like to do is step back and take a look at the budget from

three vantage points. It is kind of like we farmers do before planting season. We look at the condition of the soil and prospects of various crops. The first vantage point will be looking at what the budget purports to do. From this angle, I am going to look at what the Democratic leadership says the budget is designed to do and whether those purposes make sense from a fiscal standpoint. The second vantage point will be looking at how well the budget carries out its stated purpose. The third vantage point will be looking at what the reconciliation would mean for the Senate. I will address the reconciliation in a separate speech later. I believe I will wait until tomorrow to do that.

Let's start off with the first question: What does the Democratic leadership say this budget is designed to do? Then, after stating what they say it does, we need to look at the fiscal consequences of that policy.

The budget's proponents claim it is all about fiscal responsibility. There are two basic parts to the Federal ledger: the revenue part and the spending part. If we spend more than we take in, then the Treasury sells more debt. This has been the pattern of much of the post-World War II period. If we spend less than we take in, then the Treasury buys back debt.

When we look at this budget over the short term, it contains a material increase in spending. Over the next fiscal year, the discretionary spending rises by 9 percent over last year's spending.

Now, how many Americans got a 9-percent raise? How many American families raised their discretionary household spending by 9 percent? On the spending side of the ledger, spending, then, goes up, and I say fairly dramatically. You would think proponents of fiscal responsibility would be looking at spending cuts, not 9 percent increases.

It is a different story on the other side of the ledger, the revenue side. Let me start off with one smidgeon of good news on the revenue side in this budget resolution. The alternative minimum tax patch expired the first day of this year. If that patch is not addressed, 25 million families, most of them middle-income families, would pay an average of at least \$2,000 in AMT this year. The chairman reduced the revenue baseline by \$62 billion, which is a revenue loss from extending that patch. All middle-income Americans ought to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee—and I thank him on the Senate floor right now—for that provision.

Unfortunately, for years beyond 2008, pay-go still applies, so there is a big Senate hurdle built into this budget to patching the alternative minimum tax in years beyond 2008.

The rest of current law expired or expiring tax relief provisions will need to be offset with other tax increases. There are also several bipartisan tax bills that would require offsetting tax increases under this budget. That is a

very large tax increase over the next fiscal year. My staff calculates that tax increase to be roughly \$150 billion.

The definition of "fiscal responsibility" under this budget, over the fiscal year, is higher spending of \$22 billion and higher taxes of \$150 billion. Is that a legitimate fiscal goal? Is that the notion of fiscal responsibility the American people were looking for when they turned congressional power over to the Democrats in November 2006? Did we in Congress misread those results? Did the people really want us to increase spending and to raise taxes?

Now, that is not what I am hearing from back home. What I heard from folks across Iowa was: Rein in spending. Live within your means.

It seems to me if you are going to assume the mantle of fiscal discipline, you ought to treat a dollar of new tax relief the same as a dollar of new spending.

What do I mean by "new spending?" I mean spending above the Congressional Budget Office baseline. And what do I mean by "new tax relief?" I mean new tax policy that loses revenue. I do not mean extension of existing tax policy.

We see the same pattern over the 5-year period of this budget. Over 5 years, the tax hike and the spending increases grow exponentially. On the spending side, discretionary spending grows by \$211 billion. When you throw in the special reserve funds, you can add another \$300 billion in new spending on top of that.

Over the 5 years, the budget assumes a dramatic tax increase—at least \$1.2 trillion. In 2011, the bipartisan tax relief plans of 2001 and 2003 will expire. Some folks will call these provisions the Bush tax cuts. It is true President Bush signed both bills, but the bipartisan compromises occurred in the Finance Committee. In 2011, President Bush will have been gone from office by more than 2 years. He will probably be hanging around his ranch in Crawford, TX. You can call this package of tax relief for virtually every American the Bush tax cuts, but for the taxpayer, if we let them expire, it will be a big tax increase, and it will be a big tax increase that will happen without even a vote of Congress.

So I have a couple charts in the Chamber. The charts use the analogy of a brick wall to show the ugly tax increases Americans are going to face.

On this chart, you see a family of four. That is the average American family. Here is the husband, his wife, and two children. The family makes \$50,000 a year in income. That is right about the national median household income today. For example, the Census Bureau stated, for 2006, the national median household income was \$48,200.

Under the Democratic leadership's budget, this family will face a tax increase of \$2,300 per year. You see the figure \$2,300 for that family of four. That is a loss in their paycheck of about \$200 per month. It is a hit on

their yearly budget of \$2,300. Where I am from, the Midwest—or anyplace in this country, I will bet—that is still a lot of money.

Now, I have another example. This next chart has the same brick wall but a different family: a single mom with two kids. Here we have a person earning about \$30,000 a year. In 2011, under this budget, she and her family run straight into that brick wall—that brick tax wall. That is a brick wall of about \$1,100 per year of taxes. That is almost \$100 a month out of this family's budget.

So when you hear folks rail against the 2001 and 2003 bipartisan tax relief plans, you will hear a lot of talk about millionaires, you will hear a lot of talk about the death tax, but you will not hear the critics talk about these two families—a family of four: husband, wife, and two children; or a single mother with two children. You will not hear these critics—almost all of whom voted against these two tax bills—consider these two families.

Now, those on the other side will point to the Baucus amendment that will be upcoming—at least we have heard about the Baucus amendment—as the answer to the tax increases that I have pointed out. Isn't it ironic that my friend, our chairman, my partner from the 2001 tax relief bill, and several other tax relief bills, is the author of this key amendment?

The Senator from Montana, my friend, Mr. BAUCUS, took a lot of heat for working with me in a bipartisan fashion in 2001. He took a lot of heat from people in his caucus, quite frankly. Many on the other side who fought him and that bill were also denying tax increases in last year's budget. So they now turn to his amendment—this upcoming amendment—as they did last year, to try to deflect the tax increase charge because there is a real charge in what is in this budget. If something is not done to stop tax increases, they are going to happen automatically. And don't let anybody tell me something cannot be done about it.

At Budget markup, we were told the Baucus amendment would contain enough revenue room—\$323 billion—to accommodate extension of several components of the bipartisan tax relief plans that go back to 2001. We were told the 10-percent bracket, the marriage penalty, the child tax credit, and some death tax relief would be covered.

There were provisions that were not intended to be covered. The excluded provisions were the lower rates for capital gains and dividends and other marginal rate reductions.

Now, some on the other side will describe this excluded group—excluded from the Baucus amendment—as top-rate taxpayers and other high-income people. Now, I hope you will not believe it. The facts are otherwise.

Low-income folks, including millions of seniors, pay no tax on their dividend or capital gains income. If this budget stands, even with Senator BAUCUS's

amendment, millions of these low-income taxpayers, especially senior citizens, will pay a 10-percent rate on capital gains and could pay as high as a 15-percent rate on dividends.

I have a couple charts to show how wide the dividend and capital gains tax increases would be. The chart that is up now deals with just dividends. It shows the number of taxpayers claiming dividend income. Nationally, over 24 million families and individuals reported dividend income—24 million Americans. There are 24 million Americans, all of whom you are not going to call filthy rich. Very few of them you are going to call filthy rich.

In my State of Iowa, for instance, over 299,000 families and individuals claimed dividend income on their returns. Now, there are not 299,000 millionaire families or even 299,000 people in Iowa you can call filthy rich.

As to capital gains, you can see the numbers not only for my State of Iowa, but you can see the numbers for all the other States in the United States. You can see them for the entire United States up there on the chart. Nationally, we are talking about over 9 million families and individuals. In Iowa, we are talking about 127,000 families and individuals when it comes to capital gains.

I want to emphasize, I went from dividends to capital gains. The chart has changed to tell you what there is in each of the respective States on capital gains.

There are many marginal rates, other than the top rate, that would rise if this budget stands, even with the Baucus amendment. The 25-percent rate, which for 2007 starts at \$31,850 for singles and \$63,700 for married couples, would rise 3 percentage points to 28 percent. The 28-percent rate, which for 2007 starts at \$77,100 for singles and \$128,500 for married couples, would rise 3 percentage points to 31 percent. The 33-percent rate, which for 2007 starts at \$160,850 for singles and \$198,850 for married couples, would go up to 36 percent. The top rate would rise from the current 35 percent level to 39.6 percent.

To sum up, even with the Baucus amendment—even with the Baucus amendment added to this budget, there would be marginal rate increases on millions of taxpayers, and not millions of millionaire taxpayers. Those marginal rate increases would go up, whether it is the 28 percent to 31 percent or the 33 percent to 36 percent or what have you. Those marginal rate increases would reach taxpayers with incomes as low as \$31,850 for singles and \$63,700 for married couples, and these people are not filthy rich.

Now, what I just described is accurate only if the Democratic leadership intends to follow the letter and spirit of the Baucus amendment. If you look at last year's track record, the House neutered the effect of the amendment in the conference agreement. They created a Rube Goldberg type of mechanism to impede the amendment. Of

course, after the budget conference report was agreed to, all talk and action around the amendment ceased. So I wouldn't put much stock in the follow-through on the Baucus amendment, and things can only get worse for middle-income taxpayers beyond that point.

This budget asks a lot of the tax-paying population—about \$1.2 trillion worth of a lot being asked of taxpayers. That is a big chunk on the revenues ledger. Compare that to what is going on on the spending side of the ledger. The answer is \$211 billion more spending on the discretionary side. Nothing is proposed to rein in any entitlement spending. If the definition of fiscal responsibility is higher spending, no entitlement savings, and dramatically higher taxes, then this budget is fiscally responsible. Keep in mind that while ramping up \$1.2 trillion on the taxpayers, the budget spends \$775 billion of the Social Security surplus and grows the gross Federal debt by \$2 trillion.

For those on our side, this budget is not fiscally responsible. We don't agree that the definition of fiscal responsibility is higher spending, no entitlement savings, and dramatically higher taxes. For those of us on the Republican side of the aisle, you can't solve all fiscal problems just on the tax side of the ledger.

Now I wish to go to the second part of my discussion and annualize the tax side of the budget. I am looking at how this budget will carry out its objectives.

Let's take a look at the short term. By the short term, I am referring to the fiscal year of the budget, and this chart here is for the fiscal year. This is the first fiscal year. That is the first fiscal year out of five fiscal years.

A lot of people from farm country get their water from wells. When the well water is low, you can either dig it deeper, cut back water use, or pay to have the water trucked in. This well shows the extra demands on the revenue side of the budget. That is the bucket: \$152 billion. These demands reflect the extenders for this year and next year. The bucket contains next year's AMT patch because under this budget, that has to be offset. The bucket also covers pending bipartisan tax legislation, and that is bipartisan because it is generally agreed that we ought to do some of this tax legislation. All of these items are listed on the chart for my colleagues to add up.

The water in the well represents known, specified, and scored revenue-raising proposals supported by the Senate Democratic caucus. Included are \$35 billion in Finance Committee-approved offsets and \$29 billion that has been approved elsewhere. That total, then, is the \$61 billion you see at the bottom of the well.

When you net the offsets against the demands, you find an offset shortfall of \$91 billion. Somehow, you have to find a way to fill up that well if you are

going to offset everything where there is a bipartisan agreement of what ought to be offset. The upshot of the analysis in this chart is that known offsets cover only about 40 percent of the revenue needed to carry out pending time-sensitive tax legislation that there is a great deal of bipartisan support for and bipartisan agreement that it ought to pass and some of it ought to be passing very shortly.

Now, some on the other side will probably respond with three counterpoints, so I want to anticipate that—not that I am going to stop them from responding. The first will be that the committee tax staffs will find the additional \$91 billion that is needed to fill up the well. The second will be a claim that offshore shelter activity is a vast, easily tapped revenue source. The third counterpoint will be that closing the tax gap can yield the necessary revenue.

As far as those three points are concerned, in the preceding presentation by the chairman of the committee, my colleagues heard some of these points expressed already.

On the first point, I would refer everyone to the track record of the tax staffs to the period 2001 to 2006. During that period, I chaired for 4½ years and Senator BAUCUS chaired for 1½ years. During that period, we changed the tax shelter rules and closed numerous corporate loopholes. If you don't believe me, then just go down and ask the K Street crowd of highly paid lobbyists who defended or fought every one of those. During that 6-year period, an active Finance Committee tax staff was able to achieve \$51 billion in enacted revenue raisers. That figure should give everyone some perspective of what is doable. It is very hard to find that revenue.

Now, some on the other side will argue for my second point that the offshore activities will produce up to \$100 billion a year. The anecdote alluded to usually referred to fraudulent activities. Of course, tax fraud is a crime now. Perhaps we could continue to make progress on this front with more enforcement, but the figures bandied around have no Joint Tax or Treasury scoring that I am aware of.

I will expand on this point in a separate discussion later on in this week when we have some more debate on it. But it is tough to get the revenue that is alluded to in the speeches we are going to hear this week.

The third counterpoint is that the tax gap will yield a readily available, easily tapped revenue source. As a preliminary matter, let me say that the tax gap is a serious tax policy and a serious administration issue. I have devoted a lot of time and energy to closing the gap over the last few years, as the chairman of the committee, Senator BAUCUS, is doing in his recent chairmanship.

Unfortunately, as IRS officials have told us in several hearings, the tax gap number currently estimated to be \$250

billion net annually is not the same thing as a revenue estimate. They have cautioned us to be careful about designing tax gap closure measures that are driven by unrealistic revenue targets in unrealistic timeframes.

When we went through the tax gap discussion last year, these points were disputed by some on the other side. With a Senate Democratic majority in place for over a year, we may have a bit of a yardstick to use to see just how much revenue can come in. Let's take a look at the claims on tax gap revenue and how we have done.

We have three charts that I hope will help us understand. The first chart is the tax gap reality check. My colleagues can see it here. We see some big numbers. This chart takes the form of an inverted pyramid, as my colleagues can see. At the top of the chart is gross tax gap. That is what appeared in the budget resolution markup document, the last year that the IRS testified that the improvements in collections have brought the tax gap down by \$55 billion to a net tax gap of \$290 billion.

As we work our way down the inverted pyramid, we go to the tax gap proposals. There are two categories. The first is the Treasury tax gap strategy set of proposals. On an annualized basis, these proposals raised \$3.6 billion per year.

Some of these proposals have proved controversial on both sides of the aisle. Many are complicated and wide-ranging and may need further work. It is not by accident that they are still a work in progress.

The second set of proposals comes from the Joint Tax Committee's white book. This pamphlet, requested by Senator BAUCUS and me—and we requested this a few years ago—was published in late January 2005. A note of caution is in order about the chart's figures. The \$44 billion annualized figure includes many tax expenditure reform proposals. Some tax gap proponents have strongly opposed the mixing of these proposals with pure tax gap proposals. I will speak in more detail about these proposals as we go on in this week's debate. If one were to delete the tax expenditure reform proposals from this figure, it would drop considerably.

For purposes of this exercise, I am going to use the full set of Joint Tax proposals. If we do that and add them to the Treasury proposal, we come away with roughly \$44 billion per year in tax gap-related proposals.

As a side note, a couple of recently enacted tax gap proposals have run into rough sledding with the new majority. The first proposal is from the 2005 Joint Tax book. It deals with withholding on contractor payments enacted in 2006. Ways and Means Democrats are seeking to delay it. In addition, many House and Senate Democrats are insisting on repealing another tax gap measure, this one dating from 2004, providing supplementary private debt collectors. If enacted, the Joint

Tax scores that proposal as actually losing revenue.

As we work our way further down the inverted pyramid that I call the tax gap reality check, we total up enacted tax gap provisions. During the fiscal year of the new majority, we find \$572 million of enacted tax gap provisions. The enacted provisions represent two-tenths of 1 percent of that great big, gigantic figure that we call tax gaps—just two-tenths of 1 percent. Now, that ought to give anybody pause when you are putting this year's budget together and you are anticipating a lot of money coming in from this source. What experience we have had hasn't produced a lot of revenue.

Let's look at the demands on the tax gap revenue in this budget. We have another chart. It totals up the proposed uses of the tax gap revenue. This chart is in the shape of a pyramid—the way a pyramid ought to be, not upside down.

Listed in the first category is annualized tax relief and spending demands in the budget that are assumed to be offset by, and among other things, this tax gap revenue. You can see that they total \$314 billion per year. I have accounted for the Baucus amendment's annualized impact of \$65 billion. So the net demand on the annual tax gap is about \$249 billion. If you have been following the charts and the arithmetic, you can see that the budget uses almost all of the tax gap revenue, up to about 85 percent.

Keep in mind that the track record is that only \$572 million of tax gap raisers were enacted last year. To give you perspective, you can look at the ratio of demands on tax gap revenue to the revenue raised from enacted provisions. That is what this chart does. The ratio is 435 to 1. There are \$435 of proposed tax gap uses in the budget for every \$1 of enacted tax gap revenue.

When you look over these numbers, it should lead to a healthy skepticism of using tax gap revenue as some sort of instant revenue source to accommodate all the spending this budget proposes to do. We ought to listen to the career statistics of income folks over at the Internal Revenue Service. When they tell us not to treat the tax gap number like a revenue estimate, they are on pretty solid ground. It doesn't mean we should not be aggressive about the tax gap. We should. But the thirst for quick-and-dirty revenue raisers should not drive the strategy for dealing with this important problem.

I wish to step back and summarize the last two major points.

The first point is that this budget does represent the priorities of the Democratic leadership. It is put forward with the stated objective of achieving fiscal responsibility. The budget dramatically raises taxes, increases spending considerably above the already generous baseline, and does nothing about entitlements. Most experts agree that entitlement spending, left unchecked, will cannibalize the

rest of the budget. From the perspective of the Republican caucus, this fiscal blueprint is not fiscal responsibility.

The second point is that an examination of the budget, even from the perspective of its own proponents, shows that it doesn't work. There is too much pressure on the revenue raising. We have raised revenue from closing corporate loopholes. We have raised revenue from anti-tax shelter measures. I am proud of the Finance Committee's track record in that regard. We have enacted \$51 billion in loophole closers and antishelter measures for the period of 2001 to 2006. There are not, however, enough loophole closers to offset the time-sensitive tax legislation we face in the first fiscal year of this budget. We have, likewise, found revenue in policing offshore shelters and other activities, but it fits under the umbrella of loophole closers and other tax shelter oversight.

Finally, the tax gap is an important problem that needs to be tackled, but targeting revenue from closing the tax gap needs to be more realistic than it is in this document. This budget anticipates revenue that is incredibly out of line with our track record of bringing in money from the tax gap, as worthy as closing the tax gap is. There has to be a reality check between what is out there and what people at the IRS say we can collect, and they are much more aggressive at that because of the leadership of Senator BAUCUS. But will it bring in the revenue? We have shown that it will not, based upon the practice we have had.

When you step back from the differences across the aisle on this budget, you probably won't be surprised to find similar differences among the Presidential candidates of the two parties.

Generally, the candidates on the other side have proposed to take heavily from the taxpayer under the guise of fiscal responsibility. This is true when they are talking about ending the bipartisan tax relief plans of 2001 and 2003. It is true when they are talking about the same loophole closers for a myriad number of expansions of existing entitlements or creating new ones. Nowhere is there discussion of reining in spending. So the tax side of the Federal ledger is the only route to fiscal responsibility from the perspective of the candidates on the other side.

I want to give one telling example. I have a chart here that shows the revenue from the key revenue raisers from one of our colleagues on the other side. That proposal would repeal the bipartisan tax relief plans for taxpayers earning above \$250,000 a year. This proposal raises \$226 billion over 5 years and 10 years. A key fact is that the source of that revenue peters out over the next few years because under current law the tax relief sunsets at the end of 2010. You can see it right there. Let the tax laws work the way they want them to work, and the revenue doesn't come in.

Like the Democratic leadership's budget, the candidates on the other side oversubscribe the revenue sources from proposals that are popular with the Democratic base. The deficiency can only be made up in three ways: One, the undefined sources of revenue would need to be tapped. Taxpayers should rightly be worried about that revenue. Secondly, the proposed spending plan would need to be abandoned or curtailed. There is not much history on that side for doing that, taking that avenue. Third, add to the deficit for the cost of the new programs. Unfortunately, this avenue has been taken far too many times—by both political parties, I am sorry to say.

We will hear a lot of criticism of our candidate, Senator MCCAIN, from those on the other side. They will argue, like the President's budget, that a continuation of current-law levels of taxation "costs" the Federal Government too much revenue. They will argue that the spending increases they propose are more important than the restrained levels of the President's budget. They will argue that, despite the record tax hikes in their budget, entitlement reform is a matter for another day.

I have a chart that I believe helps set the basis of this larger debate. It shows the glidepath for revenue under current law. It shows that trend in the post-World War II context. You will see revenues average about 18.3 percent of the economy. That is the dotted line across there, so for those years since 1968 until now. And what we propose would be a continuation of that policy; we have averaged, with what the Federal Government is taking in from all sorts of taxes and Federal Government levies, about 18.3 percent of gross national product. That means that 535 Members of Congress are going to decide how to spend 18.3 percent of the total economy of our country and that the taxpayers are going to spend the other 81.7 percent. You will also see that the state of the economy affects revenues more than anything else. There are dips when we have been in recession and peaks when growth was high.

Our side cares about keeping the revenue line at a reasonable level. We don't see the merits of an imperative behind a growing role for Government in the economy. I say that because a 40-year history of about 18 to 19 percent of the total economy being used by the Federal Government has been a level that has not been so high that the public has revolted against it. They might revolt at times, when it gets way high and we have tax decreases to bring it back down. Also, I think you can say that at that level of taxation, it hasn't been harmful to the economy. As you have seen each generation during this period of time, they have lived better than the generation before. Our economy has done well.

When you argue about 18.3 percent being the right figure, often the other side disagrees. If they don't disagree directly, their policies help us draw a dif-

ferent conclusion about whether they agree or disagree. They impliedly or explicitly reject our premise that the size of Government needs to be kept in check.

We have another chart. It is a copy of an editorial, dated October 22, 2007, from the New York Times. I suppose that is pretty small print for the public to read. The lead-off paragraph says it best:

President Bush considers himself a champion tax cutter, but all the leading Republican Presidential candidates are eager to outdo him. Their zeal is misguided. This country's meager tax take puts its economic prospects at risk and leaves the Government ill equipped to face the challenges from globalization.

The bottom line of the editorial directly states the view behind this budget and the position of the Democratic candidates for President. From this perspective, the historical level of taxation is not appropriate as a measure.

The New York Times implies that the Federal Government must grow as a percentage of our economy by at least 5 to 8 percentage points. If we were to follow the path suggested by the New York Times, the Government's share of our economy would grow by one-third. The Democratic leadership's budget takes some big steps down that path. So do the campaign proposals of the Democratic Presidential candidates.

Our Republican conference takes a different view. America is a leading market economy. American prosperity and economic strength, in our view, is derived from a vigorous private sector that provides all Americans the opportunity to work hard, save, and invest more of their money. A growing economy is the best policy objective. It makes fiscal sense as well.

I have one more chart to back up the point that it makes fiscal sense. My last chart shows that despite criticisms to the contrary, the bipartisan tax relief plan drove revenue back up after the economic shocks we suffered in the early part of this decade because of a recession and because of 9/11.

I am referring to the stock market bubble, corporate scandals, and 9/11 terror attacks—all those events that were detrimental to this economy of ours and yet it bounced back. The revenue outperformed Congressional Budget projections by a significant margin, and all one has to do is look at what CBO said would happen, the blue line, and look at the red line of what actually happened.

People on our side, including our Presidential candidate, do not take this significant data lightly. We believe the bias ought to be against growing Government, not the other way around; another way of saying—disabusing people who say that the way to bring more money in is to raise tax rates and if you lower tax rates, you bring a decline to revenue in the Federal Treasury. Not so. This chart shows that we can reduce tax rates, we can

enhance the entrepreneurship of the average American, particularly the small businesspeople in this country who create at least 70 percent of the jobs that are created, and we can expand revenue coming into the Federal Treasury. That is what, on this side of the aisle, we propose to do. Are we equipped to do it? The history of 2001 through 2006 is enough evidence for me and most Americans that it can be done and that we did it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to say, while I disagree with some of the observations of the Senator from Iowa, I have enormous respect for him. He has earned that respect by the way he conducts himself as a Senator. While we have policy disagreements, I have absolutely no disagreement or question about his motive because he has proved to me repeatedly that he is trying to do the very best for this country, as am I.

I want to go back to some basic facts. We heard the Senator talk about a 9-percent increase in spending that is in this budget. I don't know how they came up with that calculation, but there is no 9 percent increase in spending in this budget. If you look at the spending that is in this resolution over 5 years and compare it to the President's budget, it is 2.1 percent more. That is total spending. That is over 5 years. If we look at just the next year, 2009, the Bush budget calls for \$3.04 trillion of spending. We call for \$3.08 trillion. That is a difference of 1 percent. That is total spending.

I think what the Senator's staff has done is to look at one small part of Federal spending, just nondefense domestic discretionary spending, which is about one-sixth or one-seventh of the budget. But if we look at total spending, there is a 1-percent difference total spending for 2009. OK? The difference between our President's budget and our budget is 1 percent—1 percent. That is a fact.

On the comparison of revenues, the President's revenue line we see is the red line, ours is the green line. What is the difference? The difference is over 5 years, the President calls for \$15.2 trillion of revenue; we call for \$15.4 trillion. That is a difference of 2.6 percent.

I believe this revenue can be achieved without any tax increase. I believe that. Why do I believe that? Because of the three things I mentioned before. The tax gap—the Senator put up a chart that shows what the tax gap was in 2001. The net tax gap in 2001 was \$290 billion.

The Senator correctly says very little has been done in the last year to do anything about it. In fact, very little has been done over the last 10 years to do anything about it. My belief is the tax gap has done nothing but grow from 2001. So it is not \$290 billion a year anymore. I believe over 5 years

the tax gap is probably in the range of \$2 trillion. I say this as a former tax administrator of my State, a former chairman of the Multistate Tax Commission. I believe the tax gap over 5 years is likely to be \$2 trillion. But it doesn't stop there.

I put up what the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations says is the loss to the tax havens. They say \$100 billion a year without any growth over 5 years, that would be \$500 billion. So with the tax gap and the tax havens, that is \$2.5 trillion over 5 years. Then abusive tax shelters over the 5 years, I believe, based on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations' work, is another \$200 billion. That is a total of \$2.7 trillion of leakage over 5 years in the revenue system—\$2.7 trillion. If we got 15 percent of it, 1–5—15 percent of it, \$1 in every \$7 in the tax gap, the tax havens, the abusive tax shelters, \$1 in every \$7—we can't do that? If we can't do that, then the Revenue Commissioner ought to be replaced and all the rest of us ought to be replaced if we have designed a tax system that has that much leakage in it, in which the vast majority of us pay what we owe but we are letting a bunch of scoundrels escape? Shame on us. That is exactly what our own Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has told us.

All this talk about, well, we are going to have a trillion dollars of tax increases—let's look at the record. Let's go to the record. What has this Congress, controlled by Democrats, done? It has cut taxes \$194 billion so far, with \$7 billion of revenue raisers and loophole closers enacted for that period.

I say to my colleagues, these are just the facts. What is most of this? Most of this is the stimulus package we just passed. Most of it was bipartisan. The reference was to Democratic control of the House and the Senate, \$194 billion of tax cuts and \$7 billion of revenue raisers. That has been the record of this Democratic Congress: \$194 billion of tax cuts and \$7 billion of revenue raisers. That is not a projection, that is not sitting around conjuring up how we can make the other side look as bad as we can make it, that is a fact of what has been done.

The other side talks about the miracle of the tax cuts producing more revenue. We don't need to look at a projection there either. Let's just look at the record.

In 2000, the tax base of the United States was \$2.03 trillion. Now, adjusted for inflation, it is \$2.05 trillion. The revenue base of the country has basically been static for 8 years. The spending, most of it controlled by our colleagues on the other side because they were in charge until last year, has gone up 50 percent. Again, we don't have to look at some projection or some guess or some economists' estimates. Let's just look at what happened on the record: revenue flat, spending up substantially when our colleagues con-

trolled everything, the House, the Senate, the White House. What happened to the debt? The debt exploded. This is not a projection, this is not guessing ahead, this is what is happening. And my friends across the aisle controlled everything—they controlled the Senate, they controlled the House, they controlled the White House—and here is their record. The debt exploded, not some projection, not some guesstimate of the future. That is what has happened. The revenue was flat, the spending went up dramatically, went up about 50 percent, and the debt exploded as a result. That is not a projection, that is not a claim, that is a fact.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the distinguished chairman. The Senator from North Dakota disputed the 9 percent increase I cited with respect to the discretionary spending.

Here's how the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee reached that figure:

1. Take the increase in the President's budget—6.5 percent over last year.
2. Add the amount of \$22 billion the budget assumes over that request.
3. These additions in discretionary are not offset.
4. Add the two together and you arrive at a 9 percent increase in discretionary.
5. I said a 9 percent increase in discretionary and I reconfirmed the figure with our Budget Committee staff.

As to the tax gap figure of \$290 billion, I say to the chairman, that is the figure that is derived from career statisticians at the IRS statistics of income—"SOI"—Division. I will reiterate that these statisticians have cautioned us to not treat that figure like a revenue estimate.

I reiterate my recognition of the tax gap problem. I am pleased that Chairman BAUCUS has made this a top priority. I have been his teammate in that regard and will continue to be. All I would say is be careful about realism about the revenue we can raise and its timeframe. My inverted pyramid chart is a yardstick of that realism.

We should close the gap, but the revenue raised is what it is.

I am pleased that the distinguished chairman agreed that 15 percent is the knowable tax gap-related offsets in terms of scored proposals. I would caution everyone that the \$44 billion annualized figures is the ceiling on the tax-gap related offsets. I will discuss this data in more detail as the debate proceeds.

The distinguished chairman's final point was that revenues have been flat since 2001. In fact, 2000 was an anomaly. The stock market had not burst and the chairman knows capital gains and other nonwithheld revenue pushed that number up.

We had a triple whammy hit to the economy in the next year, 2001. The stock market bubble burst, the corporate scandals rocked Wall Street and

whacked main street businesses, and the terrorist attacks occurred.

Because the economy was rocked, revenues dropped for 2001 and 2002. Revenues steadily came back after the economic growth plan of 2003 was put in place. Any review of the revenue baseline data would confirm what I have said.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, Senator AKAKA is here. He would like to speak on the budget. I will give him time off the resolution. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. AKAKA. Four minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I provide 5 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. AKAKA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise to commend Budget Committee chairman KENT CONRAD for his fine work on this budget resolution. It will lower our taxes and create hundreds of thousands of new jobs for Americans. In addition, I am very pleased this budget resolution honors our Nation's veterans by providing the necessary funds for our wounded warriors. Funding for our veterans is very important, and I wish to speak about this again at a later time.

The resolution passed by the Budget Committee last Thursday will balance our Federal budget by 2012 and fund programs that are critical to the health and safety of Americans. It provides tax relief to middle-income Americans, honors our fighting men and women in the Armed Forces, shows respect for our wounded and disabled veterans, and ensures the continued safety and security of our Nation.

By focusing on the real needs of Americans and reviving our slowing economy, the budget resolution seeks to restore balance—balance to our finances and balance to our priorities for America. The budget resolution increases funding for veterans health care and children's health care. It provides a substantial increase above the President's budget for education and Head Start. It promotes greater efficiency and renewable energy programs. It extends middle-class tax cuts, such as marriage penalty relief and the child tax credit, and it brings more middle-class Americans into a 10-percent tax bracket. The budget resolution also invests in building and repairing roads, bridges, harbors, airports, and schools because we recognize our economic success depends on public infrastructure investment.

As Chairman CONRAD has noted, this budget is only a first step, but it is an important step to reach our goal of long-term fiscal security. I am prepared to join Chairman CONRAD in this important mission to balance our budget, restore our military readiness, honor our commitment to troops and veterans, and enhance our national security.

I urge my colleagues to do the same. It is time that we provide a real future for our children and our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Hawaii for his kind remarks. I also thank him for the enormous contribution he made to the work of the Budget Committee, especially with respect to funding for veterans affairs, and specifically veterans health care. One of the things I am most proud about in this budget is we are showing a \$3.2 billion increase over what the President requested for veterans health care because I think the vast majority of us recognize the extraordinary ongoing need for improvements to veterans health care. Our veterans have made an enormous commitment to this country, and we must keep our commitment to them.

Last year, as the Chair will recall, the budget contained the largest increase for veterans health care in our history. This year we have another significant increase that largely parallels the budget proposed by the veterans organizations themselves in recognition of the extraordinary need that exists.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield whatever time Senator ALEXANDER might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the Chair please let me know when I have completed 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so advise the Senator.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I first commend the Senators from North Dakota and Iowa for the way they conduct this debate. This is always a model for how the Senate ought to work. Sometimes toward the end of the debate it is not but at least at the beginning it is. What we are supposed to do is act like grownups, deal with big issues, base our arguments on principle, and come to results. We often are able to do that, and these two Senators are among the leaders in helping to make that happen.

This is a week during which we talk about the Federal budget. I want to talk more about the family budget because what we do with the Federal budget makes a big difference to the family budget.

We know this week in homes in Tennessee, Iowa, and across America people are talking about their family budgets. They're worried about whether there will be enough money at the end of the month to pay the taxes that will be due in April and about whether there will be enough money to pay gasoline costs that are \$3.50 a gallon or higher in some parts of the country. They are worried about whether there will be enough money to afford a reasonable health insurance plan and whether the homes so many Americans have been able to buy will maintain their value. They are worried about

whether we are going to be able to keep our advantage and brainpower here in America so we can keep our jobs from going overseas. They are worried about whether our schools are going to be good enough to help our children have good jobs. Those working in small businesses are worried about the cost of runaway lawsuits. Women who are pregnant in rural areas are worried about having to drive 60 or 80 miles to a doctor because the high cost of medical malpractice insurance has run the OB/GYN doctors out of the rural areas. Women must go to the big cities and they have to drive long distances to have their babies.

Those who work with the capital markets—and there are tens of millions of Americans who do—want to revive those capital markets. Those who are sitting in traffic jams want us to meet our obligations to build roads, bridges, railroads, and airports. We want simpler taxes. We would like to have less Government. All of these ideas would affect the family budget. We must maintain a good balance in management-labor relations, for example, by not getting rid of the secret ballot in labor relations or keeping the right-to-work law. Those are all important issues. I saw in my State of Tennessee that having a right-to-work law helped to attract the auto industry. Now, a third of our manufacturing jobs are auto jobs and our family incomes have gone up.

So let me talk for just a moment about what Republicans want to do to help balance the Federal budget.

So the question is whether we will adopt the Democratic budget which, according to evidence presented by the Republican leaders of the Budget and Finance Committees, would raise taxes, raise spending, raise debt, and wreck the Federal budget or whether we will adopt the Republican pro-growth plan which keeps taxes low, which lowers energy costs, which helps make it possible for every American family to have health insurance without the government choosing the doctor.

I wish to talk about the other picture that taking the Republican pro-growth plan to help balance the family budget instead of the Democratic budget for more taxes, more spending, and more debt.

Traditionally, this budget week when we talk about the Federal budget is usually a week in which we are so awash in a blizzard of charts and speeches, abstractions, and competing statistics that it is very difficult to make much sense out of the whole discussion. What I am suggesting is not very hard to make such sense out of—it is a debate we hear quite a bit.

In December, when we debated the Energy bill, we on this side were willing to join with many Democrats and pass a fuel efficiency standard. This is one of the best things this Congress has done to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, thereby reducing our use of oil

and helping to stabilize the price of gasoline. But, first, we had to stop an effort from the other side to add \$20 billion in taxes.

Earlier this year, most of us on this side joined with most on the other side to pass an economic stimulus plan. But, first, we had to reject \$40 billion in more spending that the other side wanted to add to the proposal.

My point is that more spending is not a new argument and that the other side would propose more spending, more taxes, and more debt, and this side of the aisle would say, let's have less of that. There is another part to the story on the Republican side of the aisle and exactly what we would do to help balance the family budget.

Over this week, we will be hearing proposals to lower or to keep taxes low. There are a variety of proposals to do that. One would be to lower corporate tax rates from 35 to 25 percent. That would help keep jobs in America. That helps the family budget. One would be to index capital gains for inflation. That would help keep jobs in America. That helps the family budget. I would like to see us make permanent the expensing provisions that we passed in the stimulus package. That would help keep small businesses healthy in this country and create new jobs. Those incomes would increase family incomes, and that would help the family budget.

We would like to lower energy costs as well and bring some common sense to the discussion about energy. That would mean, from our point of view, more nuclear power because that is the cleanest power. If we are really serious about climate change in this generation and about cleaning up the sulfur and the nitrogen and the mercury, we need to remember 66 percent of all the clean energy we produce in America is produced by nuclear power. Instead of wasting dollars by spending, for example, \$11 billion to subsidize more large wind turbines, we could spend the money to encourage the building of nuclear power. We could encourage reprocessing of nuclear waste which would reduce by 95 percent the amount of that waste and storing it, thus making it easier for nuclear power.

More oil would increase the supply of oil and reduce the price of oil. Simple economics tells us that. Most of us on this side of the aisle are ready to give States the option to drill for oil and gas off the coast of America. You can do that at a distance. It can't be seen and it can be done safely. Then a significant amount of the royalties from the revenue from that can be taken into the State, put in a trust fund, which could either lower taxes or protect the coastal areas or could be spent to improve the higher education system.

The State of Virginia has said it wants to do this. Most of us on this side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, say, why not? And why not take some of the royalties as well and devote them to conservation purposes,

as Senator DOMENICI and Senator SALAZAR on the Democratic side of the aisle led us to do in the 2005 Energy bill.

I would like to see us take some of the money that we are spending and use it to give incentives to utilities to increase incentives for using electricity in the off-peak hours. To put that in plain English, the Tennessee Valley Authority uses about 27,000 megawatts of electricity on any given day, a typical day, on the average. But at night, it has 7,000 or 8,000 megawatts it doesn't use. So if we had ways to plug in hybrid cars at night, we wouldn't have to spend money for new plants and could lower the cost of electricity, improve the quality of the air, and deal with climate change at the same time.

That is all part of the Republican plan. Not just Republican ideas, but the Republican plan, which we hope is so compelling that it attracts Democratic support to help balance the family budget.

On the Republican side of the aisle, we want to make sure every American has health insurance without the Government choosing the doctor. We have a variety of proposals for doing this. We want to integrate the idea of every American having access to health insurance with two words: private sector. We believe we can do that, and do that in a way that lowers the cost of health care and makes a basic health care plan available to every American.

One way, of course, to lower the costs of health care would be, as I mentioned a little earlier, to stop runaway lawsuits that are driving up the costs of medical malpractice lawsuits and causing OB/GYN doctors to leave rural areas. We have pregnant women in Tennessee who drive 60 or 80 miles to Memphis for their prenatal health care or to have their babies because the OB/GYN doctors' health care costs—their medical malpractice costs—are so high because of unnecessary lawsuits that they have left town and gone to some other place.

We could enact a small business health insurance plan, which has significant support on both sides of the aisle, but we haven't been able to get it through the Congress yet. It would help an estimated 1 million more Americans to have health insurance at a lower cost.

These are some of the ideas we on this side of the aisle believe would make a difference in helping the family budget. Most Americans are concerned today about the values of their homes. There are a number of proposals that would simply add billions of dollars in spending as a way of approaching the housing slowdown. However, we would like to see proposals like that of Senator ISAKSON of Georgia that would adopt an idea—similar to what the government had in the 1970s—to give a \$5,000 tax credit to home buyers who buy newly constructed or homes that are being foreclosed. This would bring

back into the marketplace those who would buy foreclosed homes or new homes. Another idea, which I believe there is substantial agreement with on both sides of the aisle, is to increase the amount of money that would be available to State housing agencies to help refinance subprime mortgages or mortgages that are now headed to foreclosure or in foreclosure.

In terms of education, I know for a fact if you want a stronger economy and higher family incomes, you have to have a focus on education. Better schools, better colleges, and better universities mean better jobs. And that doesn't always mean more spending. For example, giving parents more choices of schools, particularly low-income parents, with the idea of a Pell grant for kids would be one way of helping hard-working American families make sure their children have a chance to attend a good school.

Another way to make sure there are good schools is to pay outstanding teachers more money for teaching well. This weekend, there was a story in the New York Times about a charter school in New York City where teachers are being paid \$125,000 a year. And the manager of the school said: I would rather have a classroom with 30 kids and the very best teacher, rather than a classroom with 20 students and an average teacher.

I agree with that, Mr. President. So let's double the amount of money we would spend for the teachers' incentive fund, enacted in No Child Left Behind, which would give to State and local governments funds to experiment with programs that reward outstanding teaching and outstanding school leadership by paying those individuals more.

We have strong agreement about the America COMPETES Act. We understand that since World War II America's technological advances have been the source of its growth. Using some of the funding we have in this budget to have a sufficient amount of funding to give 1½ million low-income children an opportunity to take advanced placement tests, to hire math and science teachers according to the America COMPETES Act, and to put us on a path of double funding for the physical sciences are things that would be part of a Republican pro-growth plan to help balance the family budget.

As we begin this debate on the budget, what we are likely to see are two very different visions of America's future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator has used 15 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 4 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. So again, the question is whether we will adopt the Democratic budget which would raise taxes, raise spending, raise debt, and

wreck the Federal budget or whether we will adopt the Republican pro-growth plan. Will we make room for the Republican pro-growth plan which would begin to keep taxes low, which would begin to lower energy costs, which would help make it possible for every American family to have health insurance without the Government choosing the doctor, which would stimulate home buying, which would make more room for science, which would adjust our spending so we are able to reward outstanding teachers and give parents more choices of good schools. This is a different picture of how we can move ahead in this country.

We hear a lot of talk about change. A real change would be to stop more taxes. Stop excessive spending. Stop more debt. And focus more attention on the family budget. Have a Federal budget that emphasizes lower taxes, lower energy costs, lower health insurance costs, stimulating home buying, more for science and more for better schools. That's really the way to create better jobs.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, Senator MENENDEZ, who is a very valuable member of the Budget Committee, as is the occupant of the Chair, is here and is available for his opening remarks.

How much time would the Senator desire?

Mr. MENENDEZ. If the Chair could, I think about 20, 25 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield such time as the Senator may consume.

Again, I thank the Senator from New Jersey, who is truly an outstanding member of the Budget Committee. He has made an incredibly valuable contribution there, and I very much appreciate the leadership he has brought to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished chairman for his kind words. I particularly thank him for his leadership in structuring a budget that I am convinced, unlike the President's budget, speaks to the shared values of the American people, speaks to the priorities that our Nation needs to pursue, meets the challenges our country has, and ultimately goes to the very heart of turning this economy in a much different direction so that it can work for working families.

Under his leadership, we have a budget that I am proud to support on the floor of the Senate. And whether you live in the East or West or North or South, I think Americans will find this budget, as they become more fully aware of it, is one that has the integrity, the honesty, as well as the purposes to meet the challenges. The chairman deserves enormous credit for working with all Members on both sides to try to achieve those goals, and I appreciate his leadership.

Madam President, this week in the Senate, we are fighting for the economic future of America. This is the week that we put together on the floor of the Senate the Federal Government's budget. And that budget is more than just a balance sheet of revenues and expenditures, it is a balance sheet of priorities and values. The lines of numbers come together to form a bigger picture, laying out a vision of where we plan to lead the Nation.

Every year, when we make the budget, we look at where our country stands, at how we can improve the lives of the American people, and what we can do to make sound investments that brighten the future of generations to come.

It is a responsibility that we cannot afford to take lightly. When we create a budget, we have to answer some fundamental questions: What are the most important problems we face as a nation? What are the challenges of middle-class working families? How do we meet those challenges?

Several weeks ago, President Bush gave us his answer. And his answer was, there is nothing wrong with America that cannot be fixed by giving away more tax breaks to the wealthy, giving away more subsidies to big oil companies, continuing the war in Iraq, and never admitting what it costs.

The President is fighting to keep taxes low for the wealthy and wants to make it up by charging veterans more for their health care. Apparently, that is the answer some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are giving as well. They agree with the President the American people should cover their eyes, pretend their problems do not exist, that everything magically will work itself out.

I believe a vote for the President's budget is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for the way things are going in America in terms of this economy.

The Democrats see things quite differently. Here is what we see: Our economy is continuously weakening, and tens of thousands of people are losing their jobs. The price we pay for health care is spiking through the roof, while the value of our homes is falling through the floor. Baby boomers worry about whether they are going to be able to retire with dignity, and senior Americans are worried that the strong base of Social Security could crumble right under them. Our climate is in crisis, and our attachment to an umbilical cord of foreign oil means our entire way of life hangs by a liquid thread.

The Government is going into debt to the tune of more than \$10 billion per month to finance a war in Iraq that has not made any of us safer, while local police and fire departments are getting squeezed for funds, and crime in our neighborhoods is on the rise.

If you have worked in Newark all your life and just lost your job, we hear you. If you are scared to walk through your neighborhood in Camden because

there is violence on the streets, we hear you. If your family may be in danger of losing your home in Trenton or Long Branch or North Arlington; if you are teaching at a school with a budget stretched as far as it can go in Hamilton, Plainfield, or Asbury Park; if your commute to work just keeps getting more frustrating in Cherry Hill; if every day you drive by a barren industrial site that is not being redeveloped in Penns Grove or Paulsboro; if it is a struggle to pay your college tuition in New Brunswick or pay your heating bill in Toms River or pay your health care costs in Edison, Democrats understand what people—certainly I do—all across America are going through.

None of us can stand and pretend one budget can be the magic bullet that makes all of these problems disappear. One year is not enough time for that. One year cannot undo 7 years of the Bush administration's mismanagement that turned a record surplus into a soaring deficit. And 1 year cannot undo 5 years of a war in Iraq that has claimed thousands of American lives and incinerated more than a half trillion dollars that we could have used to make American lives better.

In one budget we cannot fully fund all of the programs that deserve our support or give the tax relief we want to middle-class working families, not under this administration. But this year, we can set the wheels in motion of the long and indispensable process of change. We can develop a plan to meet the challenges we face head on, and we can start to move our country forward.

This is exactly what the Senate Democratic budget does. Here is the vision our budget puts forth for our Nation, a nation that is more prosperous, with more affordable health care, on the path to energy independence, a nation of safer neighborhoods, better schools, a nation of which we can all be proud.

Above all, our budget is designed to get our economy growing, get our economy growing and moving again. That is the first and foremost priority of this budget. The Bush budget, supported by many of our Republican colleagues, creates jobs in China, while the Democratic budget creates good-paying jobs in America. The Democratic budget focuses on rebuilding our infrastructure, expanding incentives for green initiatives and industries, and investing in math, science, and engineering and technology so American businesses can create and keep the best jobs here in America.

Our budget puts the family budget first. It provides middle-class tax relief by extending the marriage penalty relief, a child tax credit, a patch for the alternative minimum tax that will protect millions of middle-class families from paying higher taxes next year; it works to make college more affordable by extending a tuition tax credit; and it supports job training programs that will prepare the workforce for the 21st century.

This budget moves us down the road to energy independence. It helps create a highly skilled workforce and green-collar jobs. I am proud of the push for funding for energy efficiency and conservation block grants, a provision I authored in our last Energy bill to provide cities with support for projects that foster more efficient use of energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We all know oil and natural gas prices are sky high, the sea levels are rising, along with the temperature. So this program is a key part of our strategy to meet those challenges.

The Democratic budget recognizes we cannot think about national security without thinking about hometown security. While our resources are being drained day after day on the streets of Baghdad and Mosul, we are struggling to protect high-risk targets on the streets of our own neighborhoods.

We know our police departments are just a phone call away during an emergency. Our brave men and women in law enforcement have dedicated themselves to serving and protecting our communities. So it is unbelievable to me that the Bush administration has reduced or eliminated nearly every major anticrime program over the course of the last 7 years, especially since crime and violence have been on the rise in the country, according to the FBI reports.

Crime is going up, violent crime is going up, and the Bush administration's cuts to the most essential public safety programs, the very essence of homeland security, go down. What should be going up is going down. What should be going down is going up. How can we expect law enforcement to carry out their responsibilities and respond in a moment's notice when the Federal Government is backing out of its responsibility to support law enforcement?

People in my home State of New Jersey remember on September 11 that it was not the Federal Government that provided the immediate response, it was the local police, the firefighters and emergency management and medical units from our hometowns. Yet in the years after September 11, the administration has left our local communities to shoulder far too much of the financial burden. Our budget, however, will ensure that first responders across the Nation will get the resources they need.

I was proud to work with Chairman CONRAD to ensure that homeland security grants that our communities rely on most were protected in this budget. The Democratic budget restores more than \$2 billion in misguided cuts the President made to State homeland security grants, to port security, interoperable communications, rail and transit security.

Our budget will ensure that States facing threats from high-risk targets or densely populated areas, communities that are near ports, chemical plants, airports, cities with mass trans-

it or rail systems, will not be short-changed. By restoring more than \$750 million in grants to firefighters, we will also ensure that our fire departments can buy new equipment or ensure that our fire stations are fully staffed. Unlike the President, we will keep our commitment to fulfilling the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and we will keep our commitment to our first responders.

We more than double the funding for the Byrne/JAG Program that many local law enforcement officials across the country consider the most successful crime prevention program in recent history. I am proud to have introduced the amendment that was passed unanimously in the Budget Committee setting aside a minimum of \$520 million to fund it. I am going to ensure that we continue to support this vital program.

We have also included language to help the FBI cut down its massive backlog in evaluating immigration applications for those who follow our rules to legally enter the country. Cutting down this backlog is essential if the FBI is going to be able to quickly separate those who have come to pursue the American dream versus those who may have come to destroy it.

Our budget puts a priority on making health care more affordable and more accessible to all Americans. We have worked to create a reserve fund to block President Bush's unilateral changes to Medicaid that would severely reduce Federal health care funds to States for low-income families. This was the very essence of the social safety net that we as a society should be judged by.

The reserve fund would also help protect New Jersey's FamilyCare Program from the President's Draconian cuts to children's health coverage scheduled for this summer. We have included support for other legislation, and this budget includes funding for the Patient Navigator Program, which I worked hard to have passed into law. If patients are having trouble figuring out the complicated health care system we are in, but they do not know how to get early screening or do not know about options for follow-up treatment, patient navigators make sure someone is there to help them.

Our budget also keeps our commitment to our schools, our teachers, and our students. I am proud that our budget provides the largest increase for elementary and secondary education in 6 years. Instead of taking money away from our schools while asking them to do more, our budget will fund programs that provide enrichment and opportunity to our students.

We do not just say education is a priority, we put our money where our values are by providing \$3 billion more than the President for No Child Left Behind, and \$8.8 billion more than the President for education and training overall.

We soundly reject the President's proposal to freeze education funding

and eliminate 48 programs in the Department of Education, including education technology, mentoring, reading programs, and vocational education. Instead of pretending our young people are not facing severe hardships when it comes to paying for college, our budget makes the needed investments in grants and scholarships for college and allows for an increase in the Pell grant maximum next year. That is the support our young people deserve, and under this budget that is the support they are going to get.

I have often said, as someone who grew up poor in a tenement in Union City, NJ, the first one in my family to go to college, that would never have happened but for the power of the Federal Government being able to provide me grants and loans. That power gave me the educational opportunity and foundation that allowed me to be the junior Senator from New Jersey. The reality is, that should be a birthright for every young person in our country who is willing to work hard and give something back to their Nation.

This budget meets that battle. Let me close by saying our debate over the budget is a debate over the direction of the economy, the fulfillment of our shared values, and the direction of our country. The President and those who support him are offering the same old ideas that got us into this mess in the first place, ideas that have weakened the economy and hurt the middle class.

If you ask for more of the same, it seems to me, you get more of the same. Those who are happy with the economy that we are in would be happy with the President's budget. Those who are languishing, and that is the overwhelming majority of American families in this country, under the President's economic policies, the reality is they want to see change. That change is represented in the Democratic budget.

Democrats have a fiscally responsible plan to get our economy moving again and strengthen our national security. The budget we are putting forth cuts taxes for the middle class, creates a half million new jobs in America, and we do all of this while working toward the balanced budget and paying down debt.

It is a plan that puts forth a basic idea about what America should be. This should be a country where anyone willing to work hard can get an education and a job, a country where everyone has access to services that can keep them healthy, a country where a lifetime of hard work guarantees the right to retire with dignity, a country that knows its past and cares about its future.

Let's invest in that future. Let's pass this budget. Let's begin the hard work of making that vision a reality and changing economic circumstances for families. That is what this debate is all about. That is what the Democratic budget is all about. That is why I am proud to have voted for it in committee, proud to stand on the floor to

defend it, and proud to support Senator CONRAD in his efforts in that regard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I note that my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, is here. I thought I would begin by quoting something he said which I think sets the tone for the discussion of the budget. I believe it was during a March 4, 2007, interview on "60 Minutes" when the distinguished chairman said:

I believe, first of all, that we need more revenue.

Now I won't pretend that I know the exact context in which this statement was made, but it is not the first time I have heard Democratic colleagues say we need more revenue. In one of our informal meetings, colleagues said: We will need a much bigger revenue stream when the next President is elected. That individual was presuming it would be a Democratic President.

Mr. SANDERS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KYL. Yes, of course.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me say, very clearly, to set the record straight, as an Independent, we need more revenue. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. We have people who are hungry. We have mothers who can't afford childcare. Yes, sir, we need more revenue. We should ask the wealthiest people in this country to help us come up with the revenue.

Mr. KYL. I am happy to have the Senator from Vermont confirm that on the other side of the aisle there is a belief that the U.S. Government needs more revenue.

I would actually put it the other way around. Especially in times of economic difficulties—and I think we all agree that our economy is not in great shape right now; there is a discussion that we may even be in or very close to a recession—of course, the worst thing to do during that period is to give the Federal Government more revenue, to take more revenue out of the pockets of taxpayers, average Americans who have to pay attention to their own budgets.

As a matter of fact, our problem is not the lack of Federal revenues. We are collecting more money now at the Federal Government level than the historic average over the last 40 years. I hardly think the Federal Government needs more revenue. I argue, instead, that our families need to keep more of the hard-earned revenue that is a result of the efforts of their families in working hard every day.

It is true that because many on the Democratic side of the aisle have plans to spend more money, as my distinguished colleague from Vermont is suggesting, they therefore see a need to take money from taxpayers' pockets so that we in Washington, in our infinite wisdom, can make decisions about how

that money should be spent. I think that is the wrong prescription virtually any time but certainly at a time when we may be heading into a recession.

It at least is the case that our Democratic friends in their budget would raise taxes in some cases—not all but in some cases—to pay for this additional spending they believe should occur. As with last year's budget, which would have increased taxes by \$900 billion, this year the budget would increase taxes by \$1.2 trillion—the biggest tax hike in the history of the United States.

Once again, there is a suggestion out there that we can soak the rich and nobody else will have to bear the burden. The top 1 percent would pay something like \$25 billion in taxes; that is the amount we could expect from this budget in 2009. Of course, that wouldn't begin to take care of the spending proposals that have been added up on the other side of the aisle.

Every time we try to target the rich in order to collect a lot of money to pay for spending in Washington, we end up hitting everybody else. The best example of that is the alternative minimum tax, the AMT. Originally, this tax was designed to ensure that millionaires would always pay some taxes, that they could not avoid tax liability by taking advantage of writeoffs and deductions and credits and other provisions of the Tax Code that anybody is entitled to take advantage of, if those provisions meant that you could write off or offset your income with losses or deductions and therefore there is no tax liability. We said: No, that is not right. The AMT will come into play at that point so everybody has to pay some taxes. It seemed like a good idea at the time.

What has happened in the meantime, we all know, because it has not been indexed for inflation, we now this year had something like 23 million taxpayers subject to that kind of alternative minimum tax liability, something people on both sides of the aisle have sought to avoid. We don't want to tax everybody. We don't want to hit the middle class, let alone other taxpayers. But it is a good example of how, when we try to aim at the rich, we end up somehow always managing to hit the poor or the middle class. That is the same thing here.

In the budget, there is a suggestion that we are only going to hit the rich. There are problems with that: No. 1, it is not true, as I will point out; secondly, you wouldn't begin to get the kind of revenue our colleagues say they need in order to engage in the spending programs the budget calls for.

I have a couple other examples. The energy and education tax incentives in this budget must be paid for by other tax increases. The same applies to the middle-class tax relief promised and any AMT relief after 2008. I remember because I chaired the subcommittee of the Finance Committee that has jurisdiction over the IRS. I heard a lot

about tax gap collection. So we held a hearing. We said: How much money could we really collect by enforcing revenue collections? Everybody owes these taxes. If we just collected the money, how much could we expect to get? The experts said: Actually, not very much. You would spend more than you would end up collecting in many cases because it is not a matter of just going out and collecting a due debt but, rather, forcing the kind of book-keeping on various kinds of small businesses that would probably put most of them out of business if they were really to keep the kinds of records that would enable us to collect the kinds of taxes that we suggest maybe they owe. So this business of recouping a portion of the tax gap and using that to pay for these spending programs is one that does not have the support of those who have testified before the Finance Committee.

The bottom line is, we are not going to be able to collect the kinds of revenues and the increased taxes called for here in order to pay for spending programs the Democrats have identified.

Finally, there is talk about a so-called reserve fund. This is an interesting concept. It is sort of, well, there is going to be money out there because we promise we will put money in it, so we can afford to therefore raise spending in anticipation that we will put money in this reserve fund. The amount of reserve funds included in the 2008 budget have now grown this year, representing up to \$300 billion in new taxes and spending. As I said, that looks good on paper, but it doesn't come about in reality.

I will get to a final point in a minute about collecting revenues and what that has to do with the death tax, but let me deal with a couple other items before I talk about that.

The ranking member of the Budget Committee has noted something that started last year, and it certainly is included in this year's budget. That is the fact that budget enforcement mechanisms which were put into the budget last year amid great fanfare about how we are not going to have sham budgets; we are going to have pay-go—whenever we spend, we will make sure we collect it in advance—it turns out that has been waived more times than it has been abided by. With the budgetary sleights of hand that were put in place last year, we find that the same things roll over into the budget this year, with the result that, again, we have greater debt that is not really going to be paid for, notwithstanding what the budget seems to suggest.

The House budget included reconciliation instructions to pay for a 1-year extension of the AMT patch by presumably raising taxes on oil and gas companies, taxing private equity, and codifying the so-called economic substance doctrine. The Senate committee did not include reconciliation instructions in the Senate budget resolution. I presume because of the conclusion that at

the end of the last year, the AMT did not need to be paid for.

Obviously, there is an understanding in this caucus that those who oppose higher taxes on oil and gas—there are those who oppose higher taxes on oil and gas and oppose taxes on private equity, and it would be a very difficult thing to get such a bill passed in the Senate. But no one should be surprised that the same reconciliation instructions could very well magically appear in the Senate after a conference in order to get around Republican opposition to higher taxes. That is why you have heard many Republicans predict that when the conference report is concluded on this budget—if, indeed, a budget is passed—and it comes back here to the Senate, we are going to see some things that never would have been in the bill at this point in time and which I hope my colleagues would recognize and would oppose at that time.

I said I would get to the matter of whom this budget really hurts. We in the past have tried to focus on the rich, and we always end up hurting other people. Who are some of the other folks who would suffer under this budget? They include families, seniors, people with low incomes, small businesses—in other words, just about every group in this country we really don't want to hit with higher taxes. But when the current tax rates expire at the end of 2010 and the Democratic budget permits the rates to go back up to where they were before, the so-called Bush tax cuts, we are going to see 116 million taxpayers start sending more of their paychecks to Washington, DC.

The poor Federal Government needs more revenue, as my colleague said earlier. For the 7.8 million taxpayers taken off the rolls, if the current tax policies are allowed to expire, 7.8 million families who currently don't pay any income taxes because of the way we constructed the 2003 tax cuts would be put back on the rolls again. So there you have people in the lower income brackets—7.8 million taxpayers we took off the rolls—who would come back as taxpayers under the Democratic budget. Families, 43 million working families with children would see their taxes raised by an average of \$2,300 in the year 2011 on average. Take a security guard earning \$50,000, with a wife and two kids. He would see his taxes go up by \$2,300 in 2011. Take a widowed teacher's aide with two kids. Her taxes will go up by \$1,100 in 2011. That may not seem like a lot of money here in Washington, but it is a lot of money for a family working hard to make ends meet, worrying each month about where they will get the money to do all the things they need to do.

We tend to think in this body and in the Congress generally not in terms of millions anymore or even hundreds of millions but in billions of dollars. In fact, trillions are starting to creep into our lexicon. We need to get back to focus on what families are really con-

cerned about. One thousand there, \$2,000 there, \$4,000 there ends up being a lot of money to these families.

Who else is going to get hit? Senior citizens, 18 million senior citizens will see their taxes rise by an average of \$2,200 under this budget. So every Democrat who proudly casts a vote in favor of this budget, understand, this budget assumes that seniors will have an average tax increase in 2011 of \$2,200. An elderly couple with \$40,000 in income, if the Democrats roll back our current tax policy, a couple over age 65 at \$40,000 in income will see their taxes go up by \$2,200 in 2011. Eighteen million seniors will see their taxes increase if the current tax rates are not extended, which is not the case under the Democratic bill. Seniors especially benefit from reasonable capital gains and dividends tax rates because frequently they have small investments. They are part of a teacher's pension or some other fund that pays them dividends. Thirty percent of taxpaying seniors claim capital gains. More than 50 percent of taxpaying seniors claim individual dividends which would, of course, increase their tax liability under the Democratic budget.

We talk about small businesses. Small businesses are the engine of our economy. They provide more employment opportunities than all of the big businesses combined. Yet they pay the income tax rate at the highest level, which is the level of the "rich." So whenever Democrats talk about taxing the rich, understand their shotgun also includes all of the small businesses because that is the rate they pay. So in the tax world, small businesses are the same thing as high-income individuals. Is that whom we want to harm, especially at a time when our economy, being in jeopardy as it is, has to rely upon the jobs created by small businesses? Seventy-five percent of all individual returns in the top 1 percent of income include business income. In fact, 83 percent of all individual returns above \$1 million included business income. Think about that. That means that the bulk of the people who are reporting income in this category include business income.

Small businesses pay 54 percent of all individual income taxes. This is one of the worst things about the Democratic budget—not just for the lack of equity, not just because it hurts individuals, but because it has a devastating impact on our economy at this critical time.

If tax rates are allowed to rise to their pre-2001 levels, 27 million small businesses will see their tax bill increased by over \$4,000. I will repeat it: 27 million small businesses will see their tax bill increase by over \$4,000.

I might just note parenthetically, there is a direct correlation, by the way, between high taxes and high unemployment. In the United States, we have had relatively low taxes because of the Bush tax cuts. We collect about 34 percent of revenues as a percent of

GDP; in fact, 34.2 percent. Our unemployment rate is 4.8 percent. In the European Union, the tax rates are more than 10 percent above that. They collect 45.4 percent of revenues as a percent of their GDP, and their unemployment rate is almost 8 percent. It is 7.9 percent right at this moment. So if we want higher unemployment, then raise taxes. It is a pretty sure way to get there.

Let me conclude by discussing briefly what this budget does with respect to the death tax because this has been a matter of particular concern to me. I have talked to Chairman BAUCUS about this matter.

In the Finance Committee, I offered an amendment to reform the death tax. In exchange for my agreeing to lay the amendment aside because the other side did not want to vote on it, the chairman agreed to hold hearings with the goal of trying to report out a death tax reform proposal sometime this spring. He has now advised me that is not going to happen. We will have the hearing, but we will not have a markup to put out a bill. That is very disappointing. Yet the budget actually assumes that such a bill will pass.

The budget, as I understand it, has a provision for an amendment of the death tax for so-called death tax reform. It is not very good reform because it would freeze the rate at 45 percent, which is a very high rate of taxation. It would set the exemption level at \$3.5 million, which is not bad, but it could be better.

I have a better idea about what real reform would look like. What I would like to do is to set the exempted amount at \$5 million per person, index that for inflation, and put the top death tax rate at no more than 35 percent. I think it ought to be closer to 25 percent, but in the spirit of trying to reach a compromise, I will propose we at least have it no higher than 35 percent. This would protect almost 120,000 families, family businesses, and family farms from having to pay the death tax each and every year. And it would promote continued economic growth and job creation.

It is interesting to me that the United States has the third highest estate tax rate in the world and is 37 percent above the international average. Twenty-four nations have no estate tax. There are only two countries that have rates higher than ours. Ours would be at 45 percent under the Democrat budget. In France it is only 40 percent. The average is about 13 percent.

One of the reasons other countries do not have this kind of tax at the time of death is because of the amount of money that people will spend to try to avoid it. It has been estimated, as a matter of fact, that there is almost an equal amount of money spent each year in an effort to try to avoid payment of the tax as there is paying the tax itself. And by "trying to avoid it," I mean hiring lawyers and accountants and buying insurance policies, all of

which cost a lot of money. But due to some extent—

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KYL. Let me conclude my point on this, though I do appreciate the intercession of my colleague earlier, acknowledging that folks on his side of the aisle would like to see a lot more revenue because of the spending they would like to accomplish.

Let me finish this point about the death tax.

The U.S. Treasury estimates that the estate tax reduces bequests by 14 percent. Individuals are either choosing to save less or rely heavily on estate planning, which is a large deadweight loss to the economy. The death tax costs more money to comply with than it raises in revenue. As I said before, there is a direct correlation between the two.

Economists Henry Aaron and Alicia Munnell estimated the amount spent on avoiding the death tax is approximately equal to the amount collected. The IRS estimates it takes about 38 hours to complete form 706, the Federal estate tax return. Estate planning for businesses can range from \$5,000 to \$250,000 for family limited partnerships and up to \$1 million for closely held businesses. Fifty-two percent of the estates that filed a return were required to incur sizable legal, accounting, and other professional expenses even though they owed no tax.

So my point about the death tax is that almost no one thinks it is fair. Almost everybody acknowledges it should be reformed. We have tried year after year to reform it. We have not been able to get the necessary votes to accomplish that, though virtually every Republican has supported reform.

The chairman of the Finance Committee assured us we would work toward the goal of getting a bill this year but now says there will not be a goal, and as to the "reform" in the budget, it turns out to be very little reform at all. In fact, it was the same "reform" we passed last year as part of the budget. As everybody knows, the budget is not law. The budget is a goal, and we did not follow up on that goal. When I tried to do so, I was asked to back off for a future commitment, that we would try to work on it this year. Now we are told we are not going to do it this year.

So let's just understand that what we would be doing in passing a budget that theoretically has a proposal for death tax reform is not serious. We are not going to have death tax reform.

For those who vote for the amendment which will be offered here to suggest there will be death tax reform, understand that if you do not follow it up with real action to pass a bill that reforms the death tax, then this is nothing more than an unkept promise.

So I urge my colleagues, as they think about this, to recognize we will be held accountable. We now have a year of experience following the Demo-

cratic budget that was passed last year, and we see all of the unfulfilled commitments that were made in that budget now. Since the budget tracks so carefully this year what we did last year, one has to ask the same questions: Is it going to be the same this year where on the death tax, for example, we are not able to get relief? As I said, I will propose an amendment that I think takes a little bit better stab at death tax relief. I would hope we could get support as we have from some of our Democratic colleagues on that to demonstrate we want to do something substantive this year on that subject rather than simply put it in the budget and claim we have done something when, in fact, everybody knows that just putting it in the budget does not actually change anything.

Let me close, Madam President, by saying—I will be happy to yield, but I will be happy to stop and let my colleague from Vermont just go ahead, if he would like to do that—I want to acknowledge the hard work of the chairman of the Budget Committee, who is here. I know he is very much committed to trying his very best. But at a time when, as he acknowledged, many folks on his side of the aisle think the Federal Government needs more revenue, we are just in a debate in which we have to agree to disagree. He always does so in an amiable way, and I respect that.

But I just believe it is the American taxpayer who deserves more revenue, not the U.S. Government. Therefore, reluctantly, I will be opposing this budget in the form it is in and hope we can make substantial changes to it in a true spirit of bipartisanship.

I thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, the Senator began by quoting me about the need for more revenue and was kind enough to indicate he did not know the context of it. I just thought I would provide the context because this was a "60 Minutes" program interview, and they were asking me in the context of the Comptroller General of the United States warning the American people we are on an utterly unsustainable fiscal course because the debt is soaring before the baby boomers retire, and that we face a very serious consequence if we do not deal with it.

So one question put to me was:

Do you think taxes ought to be raised?

Senator CONRAD:

I believe, first of all, we need more revenue.

The next sentence, which the Senator did not provide:

We need to be tough on spending.

And the next sentence after that also the Senator did not provide:

And we need to reform the entitlement programs. We need to do all of it.

Let me say, I am not alone in that view. The ranking Republican on the Budget Committee said this at a hear-

ing on our long-term fiscal challenges. This is the Republican ranking member:

... [W]e also know revenues are going to have to go up, if you're going to maintain a stable economy and a productive economy, because of the simple fact that you're going to have to have this huge generation that has to be paid for.

So the Senator's reference to my quote was in the context of dealing with the enormous imbalance between the revenues of this Government and the expenditures of this Government. My response was, yes, you are going to have to do something about revenue. Yes, you are going to have to be tough on spending, and you are going to have to reform the entitlement programs.

I also said in this interview, none of which aired, that the first place to look for revenue is not a tax increase. The first place to look for revenue is to go after the tax gap, the difference between what is owed and what is paid, to go after these offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters. That was the context within which I said it.

Now, let me just indicate why this matters.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, might I just ask the Senator to yield for 1 second?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. KYL. I specifically indicated that I did not know the context.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. KYL. Because I respect the Senator so much and was sure he would tell us what the context was, No. 1.

No. 2, I certainly agree with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee on both of the subsequent two comments: one, that we should reduce spending, and, two, that we should have entitlement reform.

I would only make the point that I do not see a lot of reduced spending and entitlement reform in the budget, but perhaps the chairman could go on and discuss that as well.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I would say to him, I do not believe entitlement reform is ever going to happen—long-term entitlement reform—in a 5-year budget resolution. I think the only way we are going to get entitlement reform is a bipartisan effort, and that is what Senator GREGG, the ranking Republican, and I have offered, which is a task force of 16 members, equally divided, Republicans and Democrats, to come up with a long-term plan.

I would be very candid. I think the truth is, it is going to require more revenue. Again, I would say before any tax increase, the first place I would look are these places where people are not paying what they legitimately owe when the vast majority of us do.

Now, I must say, I used to be a tax commissioner. I was the elected tax commissioner of my State. I was chairman for several terms of the Multistate Tax Commission. Senator DORGAN and I are probably the only ones who have

audited the books and records of companies and individuals.

I can tell you, there is loads of money out there. One reason I was elected to the U.S. Senate is I found for my State lots of money that was not being paid over to the State of North Dakota because people were fudging. Large companies were fudging. Senator DORGAN and I in part made our reputations by going after them and very successfully collecting money from taxpayers who were not paying what they legitimately owed.

I could go through chapter and verse of what I found as I examined the books and records of major companies. I have shown some of it on the floor of the Senate: a little five-story building in the Cayman Islands that claims it is the home of 12,600 companies. Now, they are not doing business out of that little building in the Cayman Islands. They are doing monkey business. They are avoiding their taxes.

I showed earlier another building in the Cayman Islands: a five-story building we now know is being used by one company alone to dodge hundreds of millions of taxes they owe to the United States. That is not right.

I would also say with respect to the tax cuts that have been promoted by this administration, overwhelmingly they have gone to the wealthiest among us. Here, in 2007, those earning over \$1 million a year on average got a tax break of almost \$120,000 a year. I do not think that is right. I have wealthy friends, as I think probably all of us in this Chamber do, who have said to me: I don't need it. I don't need that \$120,000 tax cut. I am much more worried about the debt that is being sent to our kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONRAD). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has just left the floor, unfortunately. But I did want to make two points. He has referred to something called the death tax, which is what we call the estate tax, which was developed by President Teddy Roosevelt way back when. What he forgot to mention is that this estate tax—and as I understand it, the Senator from Arizona, if he had all of his wish fulfilled would repeal the estate tax completely—benefits only the wealthiest three-tenths of 1 percent of the population.

So for all of the concerns about the onerous impact of the estate tax, it benefits three-tenths of 1 percent. Mr. President, 99.7 percent of the families will not benefit at all from the repeal of the estate tax.

The second point is, if the estate tax were completely repealed, the estimate is over a 20-year period it would add about \$1 trillion to our debt—\$1 trillion—which, like the war in Iraq, is simply not paid for.

So when people talk about fiscal responsibility, I find it a little bit hard to understand how they could dump another \$1 trillion into our national debt,

which benefits only the top three-tenths of 1 percent of the population, which means it will be the middle class and working families who are obliged to have to pay that off over many years. Sometimes when our friends on the Republican side talk about fiscal responsibility, I am not quite sure where they are coming from.

I thank the Presiding Officer, by the way, for sitting in for me, and as soon as I finish, I will take the chair.

However, I wish to say a budget—and the budget we are debating right now on the floor of the Senate—is not just numbers. A budget is about the values of our country and the priorities of our country. Within that context, it is important to understand what, in fact, is going on in America right now.

The simple reality is, the middle class is collapsing. Everybody who gets into their car in the morning and pays \$3.20 for a gallon of gas, then goes to work and finds that they are paying a lot more for their health insurance than they used to, understands they don't have a pension when at one time they were promised a pension, understands that over 8 million Americans since Bush has been President have lost their health insurance.

The middle class is in collapse. Wages are going down for tens of millions of Americans.

During the Bush administration, private sector job growth has averaged less than 50,000 per month compared with over 220,000 under the Clinton administration. Since President Bush has been in office, from 2001, nearly 5 million more Americans have slipped into poverty. Median household income for working-age families is down by \$2,500. Eight and a half million Americans lost their health insurance. Three million lost their pensions. The annual trade deficit has more than doubled, and over 3 million good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost. The price of gas at the pump and home heating oil has more than doubled, while ExxonMobile made \$40 billion in profits last year—more than any company in the history of the world. The personal savings rate recently dipped below zero—something that hasn't happened since the Great Depression. Home foreclosures, of course, are now the highest on record, turning the American dream of home ownership into an American nightmare for millions.

The reason I raise these issues is, it is important to put the debate over the budget in a general context. This is not some abstraction. This is not some academic exercise. We are talking about the priorities of the American people within the context of what is really happening to the middle-class and working families.

I found it interesting that my good friend from Arizona talked about the European Union and tried to compare the United States in terms of tax policy to other countries. Well, let me also compare the United States to some other countries.

Today, the United States has the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth. We have the highest infant mortality rate of any major country on Earth. We have the highest overall poverty rate of any major country on Earth. We have the largest gap between the rich and the poor, the most people behind bars, and we are the only country in the industrialized world not to have a national health care program.

Now, I wonder if my friends who get up and talk about the European Union might on occasion mention the kind of health care systems that exist in every single one of those countries, which guarantees health care to all of their people. Try to describe the types of parental leave programs that exist when families have a baby. Americans could not understand the extent to which those countries are ahead of us in terms of family values.

So while the middle class in this country declines, while poverty increases, while we have the highest infant mortality rate of any other country, while 17,000 Americans die because they don't have any health insurance, there is another reality in American society today, a reality that we should also be talking about, and that is the wealthiest people in this country have never had it so good since the 1920s.

According to Forbes magazine, the collective net worth of the wealthiest 400 Americans increased by \$290 billion last year. Four hundred families, \$290 billion increase last year, to \$1.54 trillion. In addition, the top 1 percent now owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent.

Sometimes my Republican friends talk about averages and so forth. That is not the reality. If you look at the American economy as one would look at a football game or a baseball game, the important question to ask is, who is winning and who is losing? Well, let me be very clear. The middle class is losing. Working families are losing. The people on top have never had it so good since the 1920s. They are winning, and they are winning big time. To ignore that reality is to ignore what is happening in American society.

The question then becomes, given that reality, where do we go from here? What we do know is the President has given us his answer. The President has brought forth a budget. He has told us that in his budget, we don't have enough money to meet the health care needs of this country. So at a time when our health care system is disintegrating, the President has decided we cannot adequately fund the Children's Health Insurance Program and that we should cut Medicare and Medicaid by more than \$600 billion over the next decade. Think about it. The health care system is disintegrating, more and more people uninsured, more and more people having higher deductibles and copayments. The President's response: Let's make a terrible situation even worse.

The President has said in his budget that we need to reduce the number of children receiving childcare by 200,000 kids. Any mother, any parent understands that our current childcare situation in America today is an absolute disaster. We say to single moms, go out and work, but we forget to ask what are those moms supposed to do with their 2-year-olds or their 3-year-olds? Should we leave them home alone in the apartment or should we provide quality childcare for them?

Well, in Vermont and all over this country, it is increasingly difficult for families to secure quality, affordable childcare, and the President's brilliant response is, let's cut the number of children receiving childcare assistance by 200,000.

My friend from Arizona said: Are there some people who want to spend more money? And I said: Yes, I do. I do not want the children in this country to have the dubious distinction of having the highest rate of poverty of any major country on Earth, and I would hope that every Member of the Senate would be deeply humiliated and embarrassed about that reality taking place within this country.

There is a housing crisis all over America—in Vermont and all over America—and I am not just talking about foreclosures. I am talking about the needs of working families to find safe and affordable housing. The President's response in the middle of this crisis is, let's provide 100,000 fewer section 8 housing vouchers to low-income families.

The President, in his budget, has said there is not enough money for special education. We made a promise to school districts all over America decades ago. We said: If you mainstream kids—which I think is a great idea—we will pick up the very high cost of special education. That was the promise. Today, in Vermont and all over America, more and more kids are coming in with special ed needs. School districts are paying outrageously high property taxes to accommodate those kids. I think it is time to keep the promise we made to school districts and adequately fund special education. Yes, I think we should do that.

I think we should adequately fund Head Start so all of the families in America who want their kids to get a decent start so they are not behind when they enter the first grade have that opportunity. But somehow, in the midst of not funding the needs of our kids, as well as not funding housing, not funding LIHEAP, not funding virtually every need of low- and middle-income families, the President does have some money available. If you are rich, the President has money available for you. The President believes we have enough money to provide \$812 billion in tax cuts for households earning more than \$1 million per year over the next decade—not for our children, not for the homeless, not for the hungry, but for people who are earning over \$1 million a year.

That is an absurd and obscene sense of priorities. Fortunately, while the budget resolution we will be debating this week is not perfect, it is a vast improvement over the President's budget. I thank the Presiding Officer, Senator CONRAD, for his hard work in giving us that budget. Instead of cutting back on the educational needs of this country, this budget resolution provides \$5.4 billion more than the President's request for education, including the largest increase for elementary and secondary education programs since 2002. Instead of cutting back on the needs of our veterans—which has long been the history of the Bush administration—this budget resolution provides a \$3.2 billion increase over the President's budget for our veterans. Instead of ignoring the urgent need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels, this budget resolution provides \$8.45 billion to invest in clean energy, creating millions of good-paying, green-collar jobs and energy efficiency.

Instead of cutting back on our Nation's enormous infrastructure needs—can you imagine the engineers, civil engineers, telling us we have over \$1 trillion in unmet infrastructure needs, and this White House is refusing to even acknowledge the severity of the problem and is asking the cities and towns that are hard pressed to come up with the money?

This budget resolution provides almost \$9 billion more than the President for our roads, bridges, highways, sewers, and clean water improvement. It is not enough, but it is a step forward. I think over the long term, we can do even better than that. We have made progress in this budget, and we can do better.

One area to which I will be paying particular attention is our children. It is not acceptable to me, as I said earlier, that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty among our children. Where are all of those people who keep talking about family values? How do they continue to ignore the reality that, by far, we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country? Nearly one out of every five children in this country lives in poverty. That is not a family value; that is a national disgrace.

What happens to these kids when they become adults? Many of them will do well, but many of them will not. My colleagues may have recently seen an article in many of the papers talking about the fact that the United States has more people behind bars, at great expense—great expense for States and for the Federal Government—than any other country; more than China in total numbers. I happen to believe there is a correlation between the fact that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty and kids who drop off the wagon when they are young—they drop out of society, they do drugs, they do destructive activity, they end up in jail, and we spend \$50,000 to keep them in jail—rather than providing the

childcare and educational opportunities they need.

In my opinion, there are three major trends in American society that we should be addressing in this budget process. First, the fact that the United States has the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country, and the gap between the very rich and everyone else is growing wider.

Second, as I mentioned earlier, we have the highest rate of childhood poverty. Third—and I know the Presiding Officer has made this point over and over again—we have a \$9.2 trillion national debt, which is soaring to \$10 trillion; that under the Bush administration we have seen a \$3 trillion increase in the national debt. This is a debt that is unsustainable economically, and it is a debt that is immoral because we are simply piling it up and leaving it to our kids and our grandchildren.

I think those are some of the trends in American society that we should be dealing with in this budget. This week, I will be offering an amendment which is being cosponsored by Senators DURBIN, MIKULSKI and BOXER, which is a very simple amendment. It doesn't go as far as I personally would like it to go, but it is a step forward perhaps in changing the nature of the debate that we have on the floor of the Senate. It puts the needs of our kids, working families, persons with disabilities, and senior citizens on fixed incomes ahead of the wealthy few. That is what it does.

Specifically, this amendment would restore the top income tax bracket to 39.6 percent for households earning more than \$1 million per year.

That is the only group of people impacted, households earning more than \$1 million a year. That is three-tenths of 1 percent of our population. We use that revenue to address the urgent unmet needs of our kids, dealing with job creation and deficit reduction.

According to the Joint Tax Committee, restoring the top income tax bracket for people making more than \$1 million to what it was in 2000, before the Bush tax breaks for the wealthy, would increase revenue by \$32.5 billion over the next 3 years, including \$10.8 billion in fiscal year 2009 alone.

We have a choice in the Senate. We can give \$32.5 billion to the top three-tenths of 1 percent, or people making at least \$1 million a year, including billionaires, or else we can do something else with this money. Let me suggest we should do something else. Let me suggest that at a time when all of the Presidential candidates are talking about change, change, change, when the American people want to move our country in a new direction, maybe the Senate can begin that journey of taking this Nation in a new way that is more equitable, more fair, and begins to address longstanding social needs.

Here is the option: \$32.5 billion more in tax relief for millionaires and billionaires—and I suspect that many of

our friends on the Republican side think that is a great idea—or there is another option. It is \$10 billion over a 3-year period to go into the program of special ed. This will not only allow school districts the opportunity to better educate kids with special ed needs, it will also lower property taxes and local taxes. Most importantly, it will keep the promise that was made to school districts all over this country.

The Federal Government made a promise that it would fund 40 percent of the cost of special ed. Unfortunately, today we are about at 17 percent. If you want to raise our credibility, let's keep the promise we made to school districts all over America and take care of some of our most vulnerable kids. So \$10 billion goes to that.

Then this amendment would also increase Head Start by \$5 billion over the next 3 years. Every study indicates that Head Start works. It gives kids, who otherwise don't have the intellectual and emotional environment, the chance to do well when they get to school. It is a good investment. It is better to invest \$5 billion in Head Start than it would be in jails.

This amendment would provide a \$4 billion increase for the Child Care Development Block Grant Program so that working families all over this country will have a fair shot at trying to find affordable childcare.

This amendment puts a \$3.5 billion increase into the Food Stamp Program. In my view, hunger in America is not something we should be about. This will take us a small step toward addressing hunger.

This amendment would put \$4 billion into the LIHEAP program because nobody in America should go cold in the winter or die of heat exposure when the temperature gets to 120 and they don't have an air conditioner.

This amendment would also provide \$3 billion for school construction, and it would create good-paying jobs in the process and make sure our kids have good schools in which to learn.

Also, this amendment would reduce the deficit by \$3 billion. So that is what we do. We reduce the deficit, protect our children, and protect the most vulnerable people. That is one option. Or we give another \$32 billion in tax relief to people who don't need it. I think the choice is pretty clear. I hope this amendment will receive widespread support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. First, I thank our colleague from Vermont, who is passionate and cares very deeply about people in the country, about their future, and about the children. I could not agree more with him about what has been the underfunding of a very important investment, and that is special education.

The Federal Government was supposed to pay 40 percent of special edu-

cation and has never, I believe, gotten over 18 or 19 percent. So I thank the Senator for the amendment he will offer later.

I thank the Budget Committee chairman also who is someone who does such an extraordinary job on a daily basis on such a wide range of issues. There is no one more committed to the long-term fiscal health of the country, no one more committed to getting our priorities right, no one who works more effectively across the aisle to bring people together to do the right thing. So I thank our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for all of his incredible leadership and pointing us in the right direction and creating a budget resolution that I am proud of.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who is an incredibly valuable member of the Budget Committee, and also incredibly important member of the Finance Committee and the Agriculture Committee. We are able to serve on three committees together, and that is rare around here. My admiration for her grows every day. In terms of her leadership, we could not have produced a budget resolution as responsible as this one, nor one that embraces the needs of the American people and their values as closely as this one without the leadership of the Senator from Michigan. I wanted to tell her how much I appreciate that.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator. That means a lot.

Mr. President, I am going to take a few minutes because I expect to have multiple opportunities in which to participate and talk about various parts of the budget resolution that I believe reflect the values and priorities of the American people. That is what budgets are. That is what our own individual budgets are.

When we look at our checkbooks and where we spend our money, we hope it reflects the values we want to project. Sometimes it does and sometimes it doesn't in my own budget, my own checkbook. But the reality is, that is our job in terms of the Federal budget and where we invest that makes sense for American families.

I have to say that listening to colleagues tonight, as I had the opportunity to preside—colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I heard more of the same, unfortunately, that we have seen for the last 8 years. Six of those eight years have been dominated by colleagues on the other side of the aisle, by a Republican President and a Republican Congress. Unfortunately, in my mind, when we talk about what they are going to propose, in totality what we see is more debt. We see more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, more spending in Iraq and, at the same time, we see less investment in America. That is exactly the opposite of what we ought to be doing.

Our budget changes that. It focuses on balancing the budget by 2012 and 2013. It provides middle-class tax cuts so we can make sure the folks who are trying to hold things together—everybody talks about middle-class families and middle-class people being squeezed, seeing gas prices and health care and childcare costs go up. Yet the reality is, unfortunately, the budget put forward by the President doesn't help them at all. I am proud to say we have a budget that, in fact, invests in America. I want to speak to one piece of that.

Last year, we set up three main priorities for our budget, and I was very proud of those—one to fully fund veterans health care and make sure we are keeping the promises to the veterans of America. We did it last year, and we are doing it again this year. We will continue, as long as we are in the majority, to make sure that is the case. We want to make sure people have the opportunity to go to college. We passed the largest package since the GI bill after World War II. No. 3 was children's health insurance, which we passed on a bipartisan basis. It was an extraordinary effort. We actually had the votes to overturn a Presidential veto and could not do that in the House of Representatives. We added 10 million children to the Children's Health Insurance Program, which gives them the opportunity to make sure their children have health insurance.

This year, we continue those things, but we have three more items we have picked. Mr. President, just to be simple, what I would say is our priorities are jobs, jobs, jobs. I can tell you, coming from the great State of Michigan, that is certainly what we want our focus to be on. We are talking about middle-income families who are struggling. And the best stimulus that you can possibly give somebody is a good-paying job so they can pay their bills, take care of their family, send their kids to college, and be able to have the American dream. I am very proud of the fact that our budget focuses on three priorities: jobs, jobs, jobs. How?

We have three pieces in our budget. We focus on green-collar jobs. I am very proud of the fact that the initiative I put forward is incorporated. The Presiding Officer is passionate about pieces of this legislation as well. We know there is a new economy. We know that alternative energy and moving forward in ways that will address global warming and stop our dependence on foreign oil can create jobs as well. So we have a major new initiative in this bill for green-collar jobs.

Secondly, jobs rebuilding America—water projects, sewers, roads, bridges. We are at a point in our country where we have an aging infrastructure. A lot of we baby boomers are aging but at the same time so is the infrastructure around us. The great thing about investing and rebuilding America is that these are not jobs you can outsource to another country; these are jobs right

here in America—good-paying jobs. That is our second priority.

Our third priority is to continue our focus on education and job training. We know we need to refocus on job training and on those who lost jobs because of trade by fully funding trade adjustment assistance for people to go back to school and gain new opportunities.

Mr. President, we are saying jobs, jobs, jobs. I want to focus specifically on the piece in which I have been most involved. This is very exciting. We passed an energy bill last year with a number of programs in it that were not funded but that were great ideas. This year, we come back and say let's make those things a reality in this budget.

Energy efficiency and conservation: Providing over \$1.1 billion for State and local communities to not only focus on energy efficiency and conservation but buildings and weatherization. There is a huge amount of energy savings to be had by focusing in this area. It also creates lots and lots of jobs. It will put people to work weatherizing buildings and focusing on energy efficiency.

Advanced batteries: For us to go where we want to go in terms of new alternative fuel vehicles, it involves focusing on advanced battery technology. We are doing that but not nearly as fast as other countries. In the American budget last year, there was \$22 million. Yet you can look over to China, Japan, and South Korea where hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent. As a result of that, we see very tangible things happening. When Ford Motor Company came forward with the first Ford Escape hybrid, an American SUV hybrid, unfortunately, even though the brain power came from here and the engineering came from here, the battery came from Japan because we weren't making them here.

We don't want to change from dependence on foreign oil to a dependence on foreign technology. So investing in the future in battery technology is incredibly important, not only for vehicles but battery storage is critical for such things as winds turbines, solar, and other areas where we need to be able to move forward with alternative energy. Battery storage is critical. I am proud that we put forward for the first time an aggressive investment in innovation and production here at home.

Retooling older plants. As we have new standards for fuel efficiency coming into play, we want to make sure we are retooling our old plants to keep American jobs here, biofuel production and access, meaning infrastructure. I come from a State where we are growing the biofuels and making the automobiles. If you cannot drive up to the service station and fuel with E-85 or biofuel, it is not going to matter in the end.

So being able to have that infrastructure and investment in infrastructure is absolutely critical. Finally, a green

job training program to refocus on those jobs we know are there for the future. Again, the Presiding Officer has been a passionate advocate, and I know he believes strongly that jobs and energy and focusing on global warming and jobs can go together, and that is what this does. This says we are going to take this first step to focus on the American people.

What I will say again, as we go forward, there are many items that are in this budget that are very important. But what I am very proud of is the fact that we have put forward a budget resolution with three very simple priorities: jobs, jobs, jobs. And that is right where the American people are. People want American jobs where they can care for their families, they can have the dignity of work, they can have good wages and be able to have an American dream. This budget resolution is laser-focused on that priority.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I am going to spend a few minutes tonight on some observations. My hope is over the next couple of days to outline something that has never been done on the Senate floor before, and that is to discuss where we as a body fail. We are all the time telling the American people what we do great or how bad the other side is, but rarely do we take a look at ourselves and say: What is going on? What are the problems we face?

I had a great weekend this weekend in Oklahoma. Part of Oklahoma got snow, part of it had 65 degrees and Sun and no wind. But I had some experiences I want to share because I think they are pertinent and also poignant to the issue we are discussing.

I also note I have been listening to the debate all afternoon, and the debate is nothing but finger-pointing—one budget, the other budget, how bad somebody is, what somebody didn't do, what somebody wants to do. It strikes me that as I reflect on the people whom I saw this weekend and their hopes and dreams, most of this debate does not have anything to do with them. Most of this debate has to do with us, which is exactly the opposite reason of why we were sent here. What we have heard is a partisan debate, partisanship based on parties, not partisanship based on principles, not partisanship based on children, not partisanship based on the future, but who can twang it, who can manipulate it, who can create doubt and undermine someone else's position.

I traveled to Oklahoma City. My brother has been in the hospital for 16 days. He had a major operation called Whipple—it takes a long time to get over it—for pancreatic carcinoma. That is what they do the operation for. He has four kids and four grandkids and one on the way. I got to thinking, as he lay there with an NG tube in him and a feeding tube through his jeju-

num, what would he like for his kids? What would he like for us to be talking about for the future? Down the hall were a whole lot of other people just like him. He is 61 years old. He is not thinking about himself as he lays there in the hospital. He is thinking about what is the future for his grandkids.

I visited with one of my longest term friends this weekend. He is not thinking about himself right now. He is thinking about his grandkids. He has one and one on the way, going to be delivered this next weekend. He didn't mention one thing about himself. He mentioned about what the future was for his kids.

I think about the ladies whom I saw this morning in my medical office about to have babies. Their hopes and their dreams are about the generation that is to come, about how this miracle birth is going to take place over the next couple of weeks for both these ladies. One is named Natalie and one is named Brooke; one is a first-time mom, the other is a second-time mom. The things they are looking forward to with their children are totally dependent on whether we act as adults in this body.

I have just been struck at how far off the mark we are.

I think KENT CONRAD is a great guy. I looked at what he did last year. He is a pretty fiscally conservative guy. KENT sponsored less than \$20 billion worth of new spending over the next 5 years, total sponsorships. Many times in the last 3 or 4 years, we have had debates about how we handle the problems. The differences between us are not that great. What guides us, though, and what is destroying our country, I fear, is the fact that we are putting political parties and the benefits of the political budget ahead of the best interests of our kids.

One of the things I hope to do tomorrow is to outline for the American public and this body everything I found in the last 3 years in terms of waste on an annualized basis. I want my colleagues to hear that again. Everything I have found in terms of waste where we do not do it right, where we are wasting taxpayers' dollars every year, and I can conservatively, just on what I found and I can fully document—I want you to understand that, Mr. President; it is not TOM COBURN's opinion, it is the opinion of the GAO, the CBO, oversight committees, and other committees of Congress that are documenting what I am about to share.

What I am going to share tomorrow is how we fail because we are talking about a budget today—I told KENT CONRAD, I am not out to game his budget. It will spend more money. That is not a whole lot different from what we have been doing. But how dare we spend another penny when I can document, and none of my colleagues can refute, \$366 billion a year of waste or fraud, \$366 billion a year. Let me explain what that means to the average consumer.

If you are at home today and you are in the 25-percent tax bracket in terms of income tax, what that means is that about 9 percent of the money you pay, we blow. So that is one-third, that is 9 out of the 28 percent, one-third of all the money you pay to the Federal Government, not counting your Social Security and Medicare taxes, but of your income taxes, one-third of it, we blow.

The interesting thing is that not since 1995 has the Congress done any rescission spending. Let me explain what that is. That is the Congress looks at our budget and says: Are there any areas where we can save money, where we are not doing well, where we can be more efficient, where we can improve things? We haven't had a rescission package since 1995. That is 13 years that we have not had a rescission package. There are lots of reasons for that, none of them good. It does not matter which party is in control. There has not been a rescission package for 13 years. So it is not about parties. It is not about gaming somebody because somebody is a Democrat or somebody is a Republican. Our problems in our Nation today are much more serious than partisanship. They are much greater than the beneficial effects of winning an election based on how you can make somebody else look lousy.

One of the important things I hope will come out as we go through this in the next couple of days is whether we really care about what is going to happen. We can look at the stock market—it has weak knees today; look at the price of commodities—it is rising. There is no secret we are in a time of economic weakness. Depression is described as two quarters successively. We are probably there. Nobody knows. Nobody has a crystal ball to know that. But the fact is, it is what we are leaving right now for these two, Brooke and Natalie's children who are going to be born in the next 3 weeks. What do we leave them? We are leaving them a gift, and the gift is debtor's prison.

Let me say that again. I don't say that lightly. We are leaving them a gift. According to the Government Accountability Office, if you are born tomorrow, you inherit \$400,000 of unfunded liabilities. Does anybody know anybody who is working and struggling and making a middle-class income or even an upper income who is going to be able to afford that amount? Just paying the interest on it is \$28,000 a year, and you have to absorb that by the time you get old enough to work. So we are talking about another \$6,000 worth of interest before they start paying off any principal. So, in essence, the heritage through our incompetence, our bickering, our partisanship because we have to show somebody up, the heritage is every kid who is born, by the time they get a chance to work, is going to be accumulating about \$1 million worth of debt. The question we have to ask ourselves is, What happens to them? What happens to the dream of a Brooke or a Natalie

and their children? What is going to happen to them?

We are about this far from losing the triple-A credit rating on our country, on our bonds. At the same time, we see that in the last 8 years, the price of gold relative to the dollar is fourfold. What does that tell us? Is there a shortage of gold? No. Is there a fourfold increase in the demand for gold for industrial uses? No. It is a flight to safety because many people in the world do not believe we are going to be able to pay back the \$79 trillion of unfunded liabilities we have left.

So as we come to a budget for the United States and we pass one—which we will, probably—we do it absent the light of looking at \$360 billion-plus that is wasted every year—\$360 billion. People might say: What is that? It is pretty easy. How about Medicare fraud, \$80 billion a year. How about Medicare improper payments? We pay people when they do not deserve to be paid—not fraud, just incompetency—\$10 billion a year. There is \$90 billion in one program. There is nothing in this budget that fixes that situation. There was nothing in the Republican budgets that fixed that. Why not? I know the answer to why not. The answer to why not is because we were too busy making political games, political strokes. We were too busy being partisan. The time for partisanship in our country is past. We may not believe that, but history is going to show it.

David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, one of the fairest, most openminded men I believe I have ever met in my life, on Wednesday is leaving that position. Why is he doing that? He has a guaranteed job until 2012, a great job, head of an agency that really is stellar in what it does in its performance. Why is he leaving that position? Because he is scared to death for our country because nobody is listening in positions of power. Nobody is paying attention to the unsustainable course on which we find ourselves. We are not. We haven't in the budget. We didn't in our budget. We are not. We don't on the supplementals that come through here to "fund the war" because we load up \$20 billion to \$30 billion more debt right on top of our kids.

We hear all these false numbers. Yes, I said false. The budget numbers are games. The President's numbers about the deficit are wrong. The Budget Committee's numbers about the deficit are wrong. They are not realistic. They do not take into account the fact that we are going to steal about \$170 billion worth of Social Security money this year—I think \$163 billion is the accurate number. We are going to write an IOU, and then we are not going to tell the American public that we increased the debt another \$163 billion. We are just going to pass that along to our kids.

I have some little things for you to think about as we outline this. There is \$2.5 billion a year in Social Security

disability fraud. There is another \$1 billion in improper payments. Think about this. Just \$2.5 billion. Just \$2.5 billion. Just 2,500 millions. Just 2,500 millions or 2,500,000 thousands. They are pretty hard numbers to get our hands on.

So anyhow, in the next few days, I am going to list out one by one, I am going to go through everything we have seen in the last 3 years that continues daily in this Federal Government that this body won't attack. When we offer amendments in this body, they are either accepted so they can be thrown out in conference when they actually do something, such as the census amendment that was in the Senate. We are now going to be asked for about \$2 billion more for the census even though we have been saying all along there was a problem there. We ignored it, the House conferees with the Senate conferees ignored it, and now we are going to spend \$2 billion more.

What we are going to do is outline thoroughly what just one office, just one Senate office, has found over 3 years, and it is all going to be fully documented, with footnotes, so you can see exactly where it came from. It is going to be indisputable.

Now ask yourself, if you are an American out there struggling to pay your gas and things are not looking great for the next 6 months for you, what would you think if all the Senators did that and we really did get rid of all the waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, or at least a meaningful component of it, and that we really probably could cut \$600 billion out of our budget, which would mean we could either—if you wanted a bigger Government, you could do more, or if you wanted to pay fewer taxes, you could pay less? But most importantly, we could live up to the heritage that is ours, which is creating an opportunity for our children and our grandchildren in the future.

I am convinced that Americans aren't really asking for higher taxes. What they are asking for is smart spending, hard work by us to make sure what we spend is worth it. What they are asking for is no more earmarks. That is what 85 percent of them are asking for. And they are asking for no more bridges to nowhere and what it symbolizes in terms of excess, in terms of a lack of common sense or a lack of caring. I don't know which it is, but the fact is, we are on a collision course that is going to undermine the future of this country.

Will Durant, a historian, said that democracies never fail and are never collapsed from without until they have moral decay that causes the collapse from within. When we are spending the money of our grandchildren today and not doing anything about the waste we have in our budget, the question has to be asked: Are we already there? Have we already risen to the point where the political class, the political elites care so much about their positions—both

parties—that they are willing to throw the future of the next two generations of this great country under the bus?

The next year is critical for this Nation, as we see what happened today in the stock market, another lower earnings, as we see consumer confidence decline. Wouldn't it be nice if the Senate stood up to the challenge that is facing this country and did so without the first partisan word about parties and said: Let's fix it. Let's fix it.

I have had an ongoing study since I have been in Government to ask Federal employees this question, and I have never had a different answer. And the question is this: If you are a Federal employee, no matter where you work, what branch you work in, or what you do, if you had to, tomorrow, for the sake of our future, become 5 percent more efficient—in other words, not spend \$1 out of \$20—could you do it? Do you realize I have asked that question thousands of times, and I have never been told no. I have never been told no.

Well, if that is the case, why aren't we doing it, when we are going to have a \$607 billion deficit? We are going to be at \$10 trillion of debt at the end of this year. That is real debt. That doesn't talk about unfunded liabilities, which are \$79 trillion. So we have \$10 trillion worth of debt, \$79 trillion under infinity, of unfunded liabilities, and we don't talk about that.

How is it that we find ourselves allowing such things as the military to continue to hang on to buildings they do not want to the tune of \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year just in maintenance costs? How is it that we have \$18 billion worth of buildings we don't want but we can't sell because of the roadblocks we have put in the way to be able to sell them? How is it that the Pentagon pays performance bonuses of \$8 billion a year to companies that don't meet the requirements of performance bonuses? How is it that we are allowing that to continue to happen? We have known of that for 3 years. Why is it happening?

By the way, what is the big stir right now? The big stir is Boeing didn't get the contract and Lockheed—or EADS did. Nobody is asking the right question on that. It doesn't matter who got the contract. It is a cost-plus contract. If we don't know what we want in a refueling tanker now after 8 years of studying it, we are never going to know. So a \$35 billion contract is going to become a \$45 billion contract, just like all the rest of them. Instead, we ought to be insisting, if you are doing business with the Federal Government and making money, you ought to take some risk. There ought to be no more cost-plus contracts on procurements like that. There ought to be none. Whoever has that contract ought to take part of the risk for the American people because they are having a great benefit in terms of the profits they are going to make.

So we have a lot in front of us. What is \$350 billion in annual waste? What

does that mean? Here is what it means. It means \$3,000 for every family. That is what we are wasting. Three thousand dollars for every family in this country we are blowing, that we are throwing away because we care more about partisanship than we do the future. We care more about making the executive branch look bad than we do the future. We care more about our earmarks than we do the future.

There is a legitimate role for the Federal Government to have the Senate and the House direct spending. That is not the dispute. But the way you do it best is through oversight, not through earmarking. The way you do it best is to know exactly what is happening rather than earmarking it. The gateway drug to overspending since 1998 has been earmarks because when you earmark, you don't vote against bills. What happens is, the next time you earmark, the committee chairman comes up to you and says: You didn't vote for my bill last time. Sorry, I can't fill a thing. So we have this almost extortion-like process whereas earmarks are granted to you if you vote for a bill. You are not even looking at the total bill, you are looking at the earmarks.

Do our children deserve better? Are they worth our sacrifice? Is it really worth it for us to not necessarily get what we want if we can secure the future? I am having trouble knowing whether this body really believes that. We have outlined to appropriations committees, everybody has been sent a report of everything we have found in the last 3 years, and it has been essentially ignored because we are too interested in making sure we beat the path to looking good at home.

When you take an oath to be a U.S. Senator—and I don't think this is said often enough—there is nothing in that oath that says anything about your State. I am not here to represent the vital interests of Oklahoma. I was elected by Oklahomans to represent the vital interests of this country. And when I get confused about where my loyalties lie, our country suffers, and that is exactly what is happening to us right now.

We have gone from 600 earmarks in 1998 to a high of 14,870, almost 12,000 last year. What is going on? Where is the common sense? People from Vermont to Oklahoma to California to New Mexico to Montana, they know better. So the special interests of the few are being advantaged while we sacrifice those that come after us. Now, that is a firm indictment. But you can't continue to waste \$360 billion a year, ignore oversight, not do anything about it, and then puff up and say—Republican and Democrat—I am going to pass a budget and I am never going to look at any of that.

Well, that is exactly what my party has done. That is exactly what the party in charge today is doing. We are ignoring the very real fact that this Government needs hands-on manage-

ment, it needs aggressive oversight, and it needs this \$360 billion worth of waste eliminated in this budget. And if we pass this budget or any other budget—whether my party offered one or not, even the President's budget—if we pass any budget that doesn't take this into account, what we are doing is spitting all over the hopes and dreams of the youngest Americans in our country. We are saying: You don't count. We got ours, you will have to worry about getting yours. We will take, you will have to give. And, oh, by the way, we are sorry there is not going to be enough resources left for you to have a college education or to own a home or for us to defend ourselves or for you to have health care like many of us are going to have as we wander off at 65, knowing that you are going to be working hard through increased payroll taxes just to pay for the promises that we couldn't make efficient and that we overpromised.

So, Mr. President, I know I have carried on some tonight, but I think our problems are much more severe than what our behavior would deem. I think the degree of difficulty we find ourselves in today is directly attributable to our lack of courage.

We are more interested in not offending somebody than we are securing our kids' and grandkids' future. That is not something I want to be accused of. So I will take the ridicule of this body for being "Doctor No," for saying: We are not going to spend more money on new things, we are not going to have more programs until we can pay for the programs we have.

And if it takes one person saying: I am not going to agree to pass bills under unanimous consent, I am not going to agree to not have the opportunity to amend them, then so be it.

The \$3,000 per family per year is enough to make a difference, a big difference, in their future. I think Brooke's and Natalie's babies are worth it. I do not know about you all. I am ready to give up something. Most of all, I am willing to give up my seat in the Senate for doing what I think is right in the long term for our country.

If I do what is politically expedient and win reelection, what good is it if I have not fixed the very real problems that are facing our country? It is time for a gut check in this country. It is time for the American people to look at you, us, and say: Are you really doing for us, or are you really doing for you? My accusation is too often we do for us and not for the generations to come.

I will be back to outline in detail where this \$360 million—billion; let me make sure everyone understands—\$360 billion worth of waste, fraud, and abuse occurs every year in our budget, and we have done nothing. Let me say it again: We have done nothing about it.

How dare we talk about raising taxes. How dare we talk about anything except doing the business that should be at hand, which is being good stewards of our children's future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, March 11, when the Senate resumes consideration of S. Con. Res. 70, the concurrent resolution on the budget, there be debate only, with no amendments in order, until the Senate recesses for the party conference meetings, and that the recess time on Tuesday be charged equally against each side. We will recess at 12:30 and come back at 2:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about S. 2736, Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Act of 2008 introduced with my colleague Senator CHARLES SCHUMER. The HUD section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program is the only program that provides capital grants to nonprofit community organizations for the development of supportive housing and rental assistance exclusively for low-income seniors. This program provides supportive services coupled with housing to allow seniors to remain safely in their homes and age in place. Access to supportive services reduces the occurrence of costly nursing home stays and helps save both seniors and the Federal Government money.

There are over 300,000 seniors living in 6,000 section 202 developments across the country. Unfortunately, the program is far from meeting the growing demand. Approximately 730,000 additional senior housing units will be needed by 2020 to address the future housing needs of low-income seniors. Currently, there are 10 seniors vying for each unit that becomes available. This leaves many seniors waiting years before finding a home. To complicate matters, we are losing older section 202 properties in exchange for high priced condominiums and apartments. As a result, many seniors currently participating in the program could end up homeless.

Congress should act now to plan appropriately for the increased demand that will exist for housing in the com-

ing years and ensure that seniors can find safe, affordable housing. Accordingly, I am pleased to join Senator SCHUMER in introducing the section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Act of 2008. Our legislation would help promote the construction of new senior housing facilities as well as preserve and improve upon existing facilities. The legislation would also support the conversion of existing facilities into assisted living facilities that provide a wide variety of additional supportive health and social services. Under current law, these processes are time consuming, bureaucratic, and far too often require waivers and special permission from HUD to complete. This legislation also provides priority consideration for our homeless seniors seeking a place to call their own. With this legislation, we hope to reduce current impediments and increase the availability of affordable and supportive housing for our nations most vulnerable seniors.

I want to thank the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging as well as the Wisconsin Association of Homes and Services for the Aging for being champions of this legislation and for working with us to develop a comprehensive bill that will help meet the growing need for senior housing in this Nation.

Senior citizens deserve to have housing that will help them maintain their independence. They do not deserve to end up homeless with no where to turn because they are stuck on long waiting lists. This Nation must do a better job at helping Americans have a place to call home during their golden years. I hope my colleagues will join me in my effort to do so.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, on February 28, 2008 we ratified the Andean Trade Preference Act, ATPA. Historically, these preferences have been decisive in encouraging both development and liberalization in a key region. Renewing them is an important step in our relations with the region, but we should also be realistic, and sophisticated, in our expectations for what these preferences can accomplish. As we look at where each of the four Andean nations stands today, we see that they are at very different stages of development, politically and economically, so the preferences will impact each country differently.

Peru has made commendable strides in its economic liberalization process while remaining a trustworthy counterpart on many nontrade matters. Earlier this year we cemented our relationship through ratification of a Free Trade Agreement, FTA. As we go through the FTA implementation process, preferences are still necessary to minimize disruption to current commercial flows between the United States and Peru.

Colombia has made outstanding progress politically and economically.

During the past 6 years, Colombia's economic growth, one of the fastest in Latin America, has helped usher in a new era of unprecedented stability for that country—kidnappings, once rampant, have dropped sharply, down nearly 90 percent since 1999; and the once sky-high murder rate has plummeted to its lowest in almost 20 years. The FTA signed between our two countries includes environmental standards as well as worker protections and safeguards similar to the trade pact with Peru, which enjoyed bipartisan support.

Colombia's own private sector unions have endorsed the agreement. An extension on the Andean Trade Preference Act is crucial given that the Colombia FTA has not been ratified by the Congress, and would help leverage our considerable aid commitment, ensuring Colombia remains on its path to becoming a secure and prosperous nation.

Our trade preferences for Bolivia and Ecuador are important because both countries have elected leaders whose record and rhetoric cast serious doubt on their commitment to market-based economic policies. For this reason, it is important for the United States to maintain a strong relationship with the constructive forces in these countries. We want to encourage those who are working for economic liberalization and reforms that promote foreign investment and the creation of jobs. We want to support those who are pursuing policies that will improve social and economic development in health and education and advance the welfare for the less fortunate. It is in these countries where the effect of greater, and not lesser, engagement will yield the highest long term benefits.

The ability to benefit from trade preferences is difficult in an environment in which the rule of law is coming under severe attack. Both countries are facing challenges on this front, with weakened justice systems that struggle to uphold the law. In this regard, an environment that supports free economic exchange and accountable governance is weakened by the inability of these governments to implement the law.

Both Bolivia and Ecuador have much to gain by focusing on strengthening and depoliticizing the rule of law. Without an improvement on the legal front in these countries, the potential for these trade preferences to serve as development tools is limited.

It is my hope that 10 months from now, when we again address the issue of preferences for the Andean countries, we will be well into the implementation of FTAs with Peru and Colombia and at the same time witnessing an improved commitment in Ecuador and Bolivia to the reforms that are essential to getting the most out of trade preference legislation.

THE MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate

crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would strengthen and add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On the night of February 22, 2008, 17-year-old Simmie Lewis Williams, Jr., was gunned down in his hometown of Fort Lauderdale, FL. The shooting occurred on a stretch of road known by police to be frequented by transvestites. Simmie, openly gay, had been dressed as a woman the night of his murder. He was known for being soft-spoken and kind. Witnesses say that Simmie became engaged in a heated argument with two men dressed in dark clothing before the shots were fired. Simmie's mother buried her son a week later. The funeral was, in part, paid for by members of the local gay community. Police are considering the murder as a bias-motivated crime.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. Federal laws intended to protect individuals from heinous and violent crimes motivated by hate are woefully inadequate. This legislation would better equip the Government to fulfill its most important obligation by protecting new groups of people as well as better protecting citizens already covered under deficient laws. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING JOSHUA KORS

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Joshua Kors on winning the George Polk Award for magazine reporting and his selection as a finalist for Harvard's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting.

I am grateful for the work Mr. Kors has done on behalf of our troops and for the leadership he has demonstrated in his relentless pursuit of the facts.

America counts on its investigative reporters to expose corruption, mismanagement and abuse, particularly in government. Mr. Kors' work brought to light the military's appalling misuse of administrative discharges for many of our combat-wounded soldiers.

Mr. Kors' profile of the difficulties SPC Jon Town encountered after returning from Iraq showed all of us in troubling detail the devastating impact of the Pentagon's policy on one soldier and his family—a story which is repeated in the lives of too many others similarly discharged.

With the lives and livelihoods of these wounded warriors on the line, Mr. Kors' reporting has clearly made a difference already.

It is now up to Congress to ensure that the Department of Defense treats our soldiers fairly. Our troops have courageously put themselves in harm's way and it is incumbent upon our government to ensure that they receive the best possible care when they return.

Many of us on Capitol Hill have pledged to continue to fight to eliminate the misuse of personality discharges through all legislative and administrative means at our disposal.

I thank Mr. Kors for his outstanding work and congratulate him on his accomplishments.●

HONORING KELLY BUCKLAND

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, our outlook on life and the effect we have on others is largely dependent upon how we respond to our life experiences. We can choose to make a difference in our world, or sit back and let others blaze trails. As I get older, I am more and more convinced that these choices have little to do with our physical capabilities or the circumstances of our upbringing. I meet people who have overcome seemingly monumental challenges and live to make a difference in the lives of others. In the same manner, I meet those with observably few challenges who are content to sit on the sidelines. A most remarkable example of someone who has responded to the circumstances and events in his life by choosing to make a difference in the lives of others is Idahoan Kelly Buckland, president of the National Council for Independent Living and an extraordinary advocate for people with disabilities.

Kelly grew up on a farm outside of Rexburg, ID. When he was 15, he became a quadriplegic as a result of a diving accident. Kelly has recalled that, upon returning home after a year of hospitalization, he became deeply depressed. But with the encouragement of his parents who, among other things, rigged up farm equipment so that Kelly could continue doing what he had done before the accident, Kelly began to recover from his depression. Recalling the people that helped him and others during his hospitalization, Kelly made a choice that would change his life and the lives of many others over the years: he chose to use his many gifts and talents to help those in need.

Kelly obtained a bachelor's degree in social work from Boise State University. He graduated summa cum laude with a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling from Drake University. He was exposed to the legislative process early in his career and realized that he had an interest and a gift for public policy. In the 1980s, Kelly was instrumental in the initial effort to install curb cuts in the city sidewalks in Burley, ID, to help with wheelchair accessibility. Kelly's advocacy then turned to the State, where he was able to help change Idaho State law to provide pro-

tections for parents with disabilities. Idaho State law now prohibits the removal of a child from a home or the denial of visitations solely because of a parent's disability. Idaho was the first State in the Nation to pass equal child custody rights for parents with disabilities in all areas of child custody.

As the executive director of the Idaho State Independent Living Council, Kelly made it his priority to fight for equal rights and equal protection under the law for those with disabilities, especially in areas of fair housing and healthcare. His outreach and advocacy has gone beyond just the State level as well—Kelly has testified before Congress on issues facing individuals with disabilities in his capacity as president of the National Independent Living Council.

Kelly has received several local and national awards. In 2000, he received the University of Idaho's President's Medallion. Kelly was honored with the 2005 Hewlett-Packard Company Award for Distinguished Leadership in Human Rights and, in 2007, Kelly was honored at the Kennedy Center with induction into the Spinal Cord Injury Hall of Fame for significant contributions to quality of life and advancements toward a better future for all individuals with spinal cord injury or disease.

One of Kelly's profound strengths is unique ability to perceive and appreciate the position of others, and to help others understand his point of view in a respectful, honest manner. He is highly skilled at helping those who may perceive themselves in opposition to one another reach a place where they can meet and find a common middle ground. Despite his many accomplishments, Kelly is exceedingly humble, preferring to give credit to others for many of the successes in which he's been instrumental. He has observed that we all have something we perceive as a hindrance to our own success, but it is our responsibility to acknowledge perceived limitations and move forward rather than devote time and energy in focusing on what we think our particular limitations prevent us from doing.

Kelly has devoted his time and energy to ensuring that those who have experienced legal, occupational and personal difficulties as a result of their disabilities have a voice in changing our laws to ensure true independence for all. His own words echo his convictions: "I want to insure that no one need be institutionalized because there are inadequate community services. I want freedom to be a reality for everyone."

Kelly Buckland is a voice of compassion, inspiration and reason and it is my distinct honor to recognize him today.●

RECOGNIZING VICTORIA WILLIAMS

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to recognize and congratulate Ms. Victoria Williams of

Menasha, WI, for being selected as Goodwill Industries International 2007 Achiever of the Year.

Ms. Williams has earned this award for the bravery and spirit she displays through good times and bad. Throughout her life, Ms. Williams has overcome adversity and serious obstacles to become a proud mother and advocate for others.

Through family tragedies and personal struggles, Ms. Williams never gave up. Instead, she dedicated herself to work on behalf of others in her community. As a job coach for people with disabilities, Ms. Williams is doing her "dream job," and helping those with whom she works achieve their own dreams. In her new role as assistant store team leader she will continue to motivate others and do great things.

As her employer's name suggests, Ms. Williams exemplifies and delivers good will. She tirelessly works to improve the lives of those around her. She is able to turn what life has presented to her, both good and bad, into valuable lessons for others. She is an inspiration to her sons, her colleagues, and to all of us. As the Goodwill Industries International Achiever of the Year, she embodies the Goodwill promise of enriching individual lives and the greater community.

On behalf of our State and Nation, I join Goodwill Industries in recognizing and commending Ms. Williams, an extraordinary woman, for sharing her gifts with others.●

RECOGNIZING THE BIRCH RUN BIODIESEL PROJECT

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I recently visited Birch Run High School in Michigan to learn about its biodiesel project. This project is an innovative, forward-thinking endeavor, and I am proud that young people in Michigan are making strides to understand and begin to solve some of our Nation's most pressing concerns.

The biodiesel project was initiated in the second semester of the 2007–2008 school year at Birch Run by Mrs. Jan Pollard, a chemistry teacher at the school. Mrs. Pollard was instrumental in helping the school secure the funding necessary to establish this project by approaching officials associated with the Watershed Initiative Network—WIN—grant program. She wrote and submitted a proposal for \$10,000 to WIN, which was ultimately approved.

The biodiesel project is a part of a comprehensive effort that includes a greenhouse and a bee keeping component. The students currently working on the biodiesel project include Ross Fredenburg, the team leader; Derek Bentley; Ryan Johnson; and Dillon Fredenburg, the apprentice leader for the 2008–2009 school year. These students have completed all the construction work, installed the necessary equipment, and run the project, including all manufacturing and testing of the biodiesel fuel. They obtain, at no

cost, used vegetable oil from the school and from local restaurants to convert to biodiesel fuel. The project has produced approximately 200 gallons of biodiesel fuel thus far. By next year, the school expects to be able to provide biodiesel fuel for its entire 26-bus fleet.

This exciting project has the support of many in the community, including Birch Run School Superintendent Wayne Wright, Birch Run Principal Mike Baszler and members of the Birch Run School Board. Mrs. Pollard and her students have tirelessly worked on the many aspects of this project. And, most importantly, these students have been provided an excellent opportunity to pursue practical and timely solutions that will benefit the school, the environment, and their community.

Indeed, these young people have embarked on an important endeavor. As a Nation, we must increase the diversity of our energy sources and enhance our Nation's energy independence. Biodiesel provides a part of the solution to our energy needs. It has the potential to improve our Nation's energy independence in the near term by replacing some of the oil we import from abroad with homegrown, sustainable biofuels. Utilizing this fuel source could reduce our impact on the environment and slow changes to our climate that will otherwise threaten our future. With this new technology, we could dramatically reduce carbon dioxide emissions and help create jobs as well as spur our economy.

I know my colleagues will share my enthusiasm in recognizing everyone affiliated with the biodiesel project at Birch Run High School. I look forward to hearing about their many successes in the future.●

LOCATING BOB LEVINSON

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, 1 year ago yesterday, a man who had spent more than 28 years serving the United States of America, a dedicated husband and father and constituent of mine, disappeared from Kish Island, in the Persian Gulf. I rise today to remind this body of the plight of this missing person and the suffering of his family.

On March 8, 2007, Bob Levinson, a retired veteran of both the FBI and DEA, arrived in Kish—an Iranian resort island that does not require a visa to visit. From what we know, he checked into his hotel, checked out on March 9th, got into a taxi, and then vanished.

I have worked closely with the State Department and the Swiss Government to lodge a number of requests for information with the Iranian Government. Unfortunately, Iran claims it has no information on the welfare or whereabouts of Mr. Levinson.

Last December, Bob's wife Christine traveled to Iran and visited Kish on a factfinding mission. Although she did not find any proof of his whereabouts, she came away with the strong belief that Bob is alive.

Mr. President, I have worked closely with the administration to try to ascertain what exactly happened to Mr. Levinson. Today, just one day after the anniversary of his disappearance, I ask my colleagues to remember this American citizen, whose whereabouts are still unknown, and to urge the U.S. Government to do everything in its power to locate and bring him home.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2734. A bill to aid families and neighborhoods facing home foreclosure and address the subprime mortgage crisis.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 2738. A bill to identify and remove criminal aliens incarcerated in correctional facilities in the United States and for other purposes.

S. 2739. A bill to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5318. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 8352-5) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5319. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 8351-6) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5320. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fruits and Vegetables" (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0116) received on March 4, 2008;

to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5321. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the personnel from the Navy Region Southwest; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5322. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Fleet Numerical Meteorology and Oceanography Center; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5323. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12956 relative to Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5324. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice Announcing 2008 Adjusted Thresholds for Clayton Act 7A" (RIN3084-AA91) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5325. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5326. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Department's uncosted obligations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5327. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Guajon" (RIN1018-AU46) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5328. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Control of Particulate Matter from Pulp and Paper Mills; Correction" (FRL No. 8537-6) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5329. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule Revising the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 8537-9) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5330. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 8538-1) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5331. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference; Correc-

tion" (FRL No. 8536-3) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5332. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Approval of Construction Permit Waiver" (FRL No. 8533-1) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5333. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Atlanta, Georgia 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 8539-2) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5334. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In-Use Testing for Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines and Vehicles; Emission Measurement Accuracy Margins for Portable Emission Measurement Systems and Program Revisions" (RIN2060-AO69)(FRL No. 8539-3) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5335. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories: Gasoline Distribution Bulk Terminals, Bulk Plants, and Pipeline Facilities; and Gasoline Dispensing Facilities; Correction" (FRL No. 8540-2) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5336. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards for the Administrative Collection of Claims" (RIN1510-AA91) received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5337. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisit User Fee Program for Medicare Survey and Certification Activities" (RIN0938-AP22) received on March 3, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5338. A communication from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2008 Trade Policy Agenda and 2007 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5339. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's waiver of restriction on the provisions of funds to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5340. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to steps taken to encourage Arab League states to normalize their relations with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5341. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed agreement for the export of defense articles to Japan for the production of the Evolved SeaSparrow Missile; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5342. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles to Russia for the RD-180 Liquid Propellant Rocket Engine Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5343. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the addition of workers from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5344. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the addition of workers from the Combustion Engineering facility to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5345. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the addition of workers from the Mound Plant near Dayton, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5346. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 17-295, "Burned Fire Fighter Relief Temporary Amendment Act of 2008" received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5347. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 17-293, "Park East Assistance Act of 2008" received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5348. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 17-294, "Choice in Drug Treatment Temporary Amendment Act of 2008" received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5349. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 17-310, "New Convention Center Hotel Omnibus Financing and Development Amendment Act of 2008" received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5350. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 17-311, "Uniform Anatomical Gift Revision Act of 2008" received on March 4, 2008; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5351. A communication from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Corporation's employment category rating system activities for fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5352. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to whether the financial statements of the Deposit Insurance Fund and FSLIC Resolution Fund are presented fairly; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5353. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an update to the report entitled "Long Range Plan for Information Technology in the Federal Judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON MARCH 7, 2008

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CONRAD, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 70. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1638. A bill to adjust the salaries of Federal justices and judges, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2737. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims to review compliance of the schedule of ratings for disabilities under section 1151 of that title with statutory requirements applicable to entitlement to disability compensation under chapter 11 of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COBURN:

S. 2738. A bill to identify and remove criminal aliens incarcerated in correctional facilities in the United States and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 2739. A bill to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. Res. 477. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of designating March 2008 as National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. Res. 478. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "World Water Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to reaffirm the authority of the Comptroller General to audit and evaluate the programs, activities, and financial transactions of the intelligence community, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to establish kinship navigator programs, to establish guardianship assistance payments for children, and for other purposes.

S. 819

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers.

S. 1010

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1010, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage guaranteed lifetime income payments from annuities and similar payments of life insurance proceeds at dates later than death by excluding from income a portion of such payments.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to end the use of child soldiers in hostilities around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1275

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1275, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a screening and treatment program for prostate

cancer in the same manner as is provided for breast and cervical cancer.

S. 1464

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1464, a bill to establish a Global Service Fellowship Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1675

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to implement the recommendations of the Federal Communications Commission report to the Congress regarding low-power FM service.

S. 1681

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1681, a bill to provide for a paid family and medical leave insurance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1760

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1760, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Healthy Start Initiative.

S. 1926

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1926, a bill to establish the National Infrastructure Bank to provide funding for qualified infrastructure projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1951

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1951, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure that individuals eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program continue to have access to prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 2064

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2064, a bill to fund comprehensive programs to ensure an adequate supply of nurses.

S. 2181

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2181, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect Medicare beneficiaries' access to home health services under the Medicare program.

S. 2209

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2209, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to improve America's research competitiveness, and for other purposes.

S. 2291

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2291, a bill to enhance citizen access to Government information and services by establishing plain language as the standard style of Government documents issued to the public, and for other purposes.

S. 2314

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make geothermal heat pump systems eligible for the energy credit and the residential energy efficient property credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2369

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2369, a bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide that certain tax planning inventions are not patentable, and for other purposes.

S. 2420

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2420, a bill to encourage the donation of excess food to nonprofit organizations that provide assistance to food-insecure people in the United States in contracts entered into by executive agencies for the provision, service, or sale of food.

S. 2433

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2433, a bill to require the President to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective of promoting the reduction of global poverty, the elimination of extreme global poverty, and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by one-half the proportion of people worldwide, between 1990 and 2015, who live on less than \$1 per day.

S. 2452

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2452, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide protection to consumers with respect to certain high-cost loans, and for other purposes.

S. 2533

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2533, a bill to enact a safe, fair, and responsible state secrets privilege Act.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to establish a Global Service Fellowship Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2632

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr.

ENSIGN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2632, a bill to ensure that the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act is applied retroactively.

S. 2666

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2666, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investment in affordable housing, and for other purposes.

S. 2684

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2684, a bill to reform the housing choice voucher program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

S. 2688

At the request of Mr. INUYE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2688, a bill to improve the protections afforded under Federal law to consumers from contaminated seafood by directing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a program, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, to strengthen activities for ensuring that seafood sold or offered for sale to the public in or affecting interstate commerce is fit for human consumption.

S. 2705

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2705, a bill to authorize programs to increase the number of nurses within the Armed Forces through assistance for service as nurse faculty or education as nurses, and for other purposes.

S. 2712

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2712, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to complete at least 700 miles of reinforced fencing along the Southwest border by December 31, 2010, and for other purposes.

S. 2716

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2716, a bill to authorize the National Guard to provide support for the border control activities of the United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 2718

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2718, a bill to withhold 10 percent of the Federal funding apportioned for highway construction and maintenance from States that issue

driver's licenses to individuals without verifying the legal status of such individuals.

S. 2720

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2720, a bill to withhold Federal financial assistance from each country that denies or unreasonably delays the acceptance of nationals of such country who have been ordered removed from the United States and to prohibit the issuance of visas to nationals of such country.

S. RES. 390

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 390, a resolution designating March 11, 2008, as National Funeral Director and Mortician Recognition Day.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2737. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims to review compliance of the schedule of ratings for disabilities under section 1151 of that title with statutory requirements applicable to entitlement to disability compensation under chapter 11 of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I introduce the proposed Veterans' Rating Schedule Review Act. This legislation would remove a barrier to legal redress faced by veterans who believe that a provision of the VA Schedule for Rating Disabilities—the Rating Schedule—does not comply with a law passed by Congress. The amount of compensation veterans with service-connected conditions receive is based on a disability rating, which VA assigns to these conditions. VA uses its rating schedule to determine which rating to assign to a veteran's particular condition. Under current law, the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims has jurisdiction to consider only Constitutional challenges to the rating schedule. When legislation was passed providing for judicial review, review of the rating schedule was specifically prohibited as part of a final compromise.

This legislation would expand the jurisdiction of the court to include cases where a provision of the rating schedule or the absence of a rating for a condition mandated by statute is challenged. Under the proposed change, aspects of the VA rating schedule that appear to violate requirements of law set forth in chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, would be subject to the court's jurisdiction.

I expect VA to comply with all laws passed by Congress in developing and revising the rating schedule. However, justice to our Nation's veterans requires a forum in which the rating

schedule can be challenged when someone believes that a statute passed by Congress to provide compensation for the service-disabled is being violated.

Veterans seeking to challenge the denial of benefits based on the rating schedule's lack of consistency with other laws are subject to rejection by the court due to the prohibition in current law. The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held, in *Wanner v. Principi*, 370 F.3d 1124, 2004, that the language in current law "removes from the Veterans Court's jurisdiction all review involving the content of the rating schedules and the Secretary's actions in adopting or revising them."

One example of the kind of case that would be affected by the change to the law is VA's lack of action in response to legislation enacted in 2002 which allows veterans who qualify for compensation due to the loss of hearing in both ears to receive special "paired organ" benefits. In the years since that law was passed, many veterans serving in Iraq have suffered hearing loss after being exposed to Improvised Explosive Device blasts. However, VA has yet to issue regulations to amend the rating schedule, as required by the law. Under the current state of the law, no one could bring a legal challenge to that failure to act.

I note that the exception to the ban on review of the rating schedule proposed in this bill is a limited one. The bill would not allow for a wholesale assault on the rating schedule. It would merely provide judicial review of cases where compliance with a law passed by Congress is challenged.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure, so that veterans seeking justice may have an appropriate forum to challenge the VA's compliance with governing statutes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2737

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Rating Schedule Review Act".

SEC. 2. REVIEW BY UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS OF COMPLIANCE OF SCHEDULE OF RATINGS FOR DISABILITIES WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO ENTITLEMENT TO DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

Section 7252(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)";
- (2) by striking the third sentence; and
- (3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Court may not review the schedule of ratings for disabilities adopted under section 1155 of this title or any action of the Secretary in adopting or revising that schedule.

"(B) The Court may review whether, and the extent to which, the schedule of ratings

for disabilities complies with applicable requirements of chapter 11 of this title."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 477—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF DESIGNATING MARCH 2008 AS NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS EDUCATION AND AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

H. RES. 477

Whereas multiple sclerosis can impact men and women of all ages;

Whereas multiple sclerosis affects men and women of all races and ethnicities;

Whereas approximately 400,000 Americans live with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas approximately 2,500,000 people worldwide have been diagnosed with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas approximately 200 people a week are diagnosed with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas over 400 cases of childhood multiple sclerosis have been identified in medical journals since 1980 and it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are affected;

Whereas the exact cause of multiple sclerosis is still unknown;

Whereas the symptoms of multiple sclerosis are unpredictable and vary from person to person;

Whereas there is no laboratory test available for multiple sclerosis;

Whereas multiple sclerosis is not genetic, contagious, or directly inherited, but studies show there are genetic factors that indicate certain individuals are susceptible to the disease;

Whereas multiple sclerosis symptoms occur when an immune system attack affects the myelin, destroying it and replacing it with scar tissue and severing nerve fibers interfering with the transmission of nerve signals;

Whereas in rare cases multiple sclerosis is so progressive it is fatal;

Whereas there is no known cure for multiple sclerosis; and

Whereas March 2008 is recognized as National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month;

(2) invites the chief executive officers of the States, territories, and possessions of the United States to issue proclamations designating March 2008 as National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month and recognizing the goals and ideals of National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month;

(3) commends the efforts of the States, territories, and possessions of the United States, localities, non-profit organizations, businesses, and other entities and the people of the United States who support the goals and ideals of National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month;

(4) recognizes and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to combating multiple sclerosis by promoting awareness about its causes and risks and by promoting new education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to medical treatment; and

(5) recognizes all Americans living with multiple sclerosis, expresses gratitude to their family members and friends who are a source of love and encouragement to them, and salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who provide assistance to those so afflicted and continue to work to find cures and improve treatments.

Mr. President, I offer today, along with my colleague Senator SNOWE, this resolution supporting the goals and ideals National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month. I am pleased to introduce this resolution which recognizes and reaffirms our commitment to combating multiple sclerosis by promoting awareness about its causes and risks and by promoting new education programs, supporting research and expanding access to medical treatment. It is also my hope that this resolution that Senator SNOWE and I offer today will help us to more consciously recognize all Americans living with multiple sclerosis. We are grateful to their family members and friends who are a source of love and encouragement to them and we salute the health care professionals and medical researchers who provide assistance to those with MS and who continue to work to find cures and improve treatments.

We know a lot about MS but unfortunately there is still a great deal we do not know. We know it can strike males and females of all ages, races and ethnicities. Today, approximately 400,000 Americans live with this disease and about 2.5 million people have been diagnosed worldwide. Every week, another 200 people are diagnosed and it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents have MS.

The exact cause of multiple sclerosis is still unknown and its symptoms are unpredictable, varying from person to person. We have no laboratory test that will tell us if someone has multiple sclerosis. This disease is not genetic, contagious, or directly inherited, but studies show there are genetic factors that indicate certain individuals are susceptible to the disease.

Multiple sclerosis symptoms occur when an immune system attack affects the myelin, destroying it and replacing it with scar tissue and severing nerve fibers, thus interfering with the transmission of nerve signals. There is as yet no known cure for multiple sclerosis. MS can be an especially devastating disease as it is often diagnosed in young adults who are just setting out on their own, beginning their personal and professional lives. While MS is not a fatal disease, it is a noncurable, sometimes progressive disease that can affect every aspect of life.

Because MS is an unpredictable disease, it presents those suffering from it with many uncertainties about the future. For instance, one young constituent of mine suffering from MS confided that she felt limited in choosing a career, feeling that she needed to find an occupation that could accommodate any potential disabilities. In considering employment offers, she not

only had to consider the merits of the job itself, but also had to factor in finding employment with someone who provided adequate insurance coverage and leave policies, and was also willing to accommodate situations like the need for flexible work schedules and adaptive equipment.

MS can also complicate decisions about personal relationships, marriage, and child bearing. Since MS affects twice as many women as men, young women with MS often struggle with the decision of whether or not to have children who could potentially inherit the disease. In making such decisions, they also have to consider options for caring for those children in the event that MS leaves them impaired or disabled.

Because many of the symptoms of MS—like fatigue, pain, vision problems, and numbness of extremities—are “invisible” to others, people often don’t realize the extent to which the disease affects those who suffer from it.

For those suffering from MS, some of the most important steps they can take are to seek prompt treatment with a physician qualified to address MS, consider beginning therapy with one of the FDA approved disease modifying drugs, and develop a supportive network of family and friends.

The most important thing that we in Congress can do for those who have MS is recognize the scope of this illness, which we are doing through this resolution, and resolve to find ways to improve treatments for those suffering from this devastating disease, and ultimately, resolve to help find a cure. With this resolution, I also invite the chief executive officers of the States, territories and possessions of the U.S. to issue proclamations designating National Multiple Sclerosis Education and Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 478—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF “WORLD WATER DAY”

Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. KERRY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 478

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, via resolution, has designated March 22 of each year as World Water Day;

Whereas a person needs 4 to 5 liters of water per day to survive;

Whereas a person can live weeks without food, but only days without water;

Whereas every 15 seconds a child dies from a water-borne disease;

Whereas, for children under age 5, water-borne diseases are the leading cause of death;

Whereas millions of women and children spend several hours a day collecting water from distant, often polluted sources;

Whereas every dollar spent on water and sanitation saves on average \$9 in costs averted and productivity gained;

Whereas, at any given time, ½ of the world’s hospital beds are occupied by patients suffering from a water-borne disease;

Whereas 88 percent of all diseases are caused by unsafe drinking water, inadequate sanitation, and poor hygiene;

Whereas 1,100,000,000 (1 in 6) people lack access to an improved water supply;

Whereas 2,600,000,000 people in the world lack access to improved sanitation;

Whereas the global celebration of World Water Day is an initiative that grew out of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro;

Whereas the participants in the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, including the United States, agreed to the Plan of Implementation which included an agreement to work to reduce by ½ from the baseline year 1990 “the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water”, “and the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation” by 2015; and

Whereas Congress passed and the President signed into law the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121), which was intended to “elevate the role of water and sanitation policy in the development of U.S. foreign policy and improve the effectiveness of U.S. official programs”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of ideals of “World Water Day”;

(2) urges an increased effort and the investment of greater resources by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and all relevant Federal departments and agencies toward providing sustainable and equitable access to safe drinking water and sanitation for the poor and the very poor; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate activities that promote awareness of the importance of access to clean water.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution supporting the ideals and goals of World Water Day. I am pleased to have my colleague Senator JOHN KERRY joining me in this cause by serving as the cosponsor of this resolution.

March 22 was established as World Water Day by the United Nations General Assembly to promote awareness of the importance of access to clean water and improved sanitation. Over 1 billion people lack access to an improved water supply and 2.6 billion people lack access to improved sanitation.

Activities are planned internationally to further the goals and ideals of World Water Day. In many cities across the United States, UNICEF is sponsoring the Tap Project. Restaurants will offer patrons the opportunity to add at least \$1 to their checks during the week of March 16. Each dollar donated will result in a child receiving clean water for 40 days. There are currently 16 featured cities, including Portland, OR, and Boston MA.

In 2000, the United Nations member States adopted eight millennium development goals as a basis for working cooperatively. To ensure environmental stability, one of the goals established is to reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation by 2015. While some progress has been made, much more remains to be done. The United Nation’s 2007 Millennium Development Goals Report reveals that we are on pace to miss the

2015 target for access to basic sanitation by over 600 million.

Each day millions of women and girls spend hours traveling miles to transport water to their homes. In many cases, the source is polluted. At any given time, half of the world’s hospital beds are occupied by patients suffering from waterborne diseases. These diseases are the leading cause of death for children under 5.

The Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 set a goal of providing equal and affordable access to clean and safe water and sanitation in developing countries. This access has long been recognized by the U.S. as a contributing factor to our foreign policy interests. More importantly, access to clean and safe water is basic human right.

We urge our colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4147. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4148. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4149. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 178, expressing the sympathy of the Senate to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the United States to work with Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes.

SA 4150. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 178, supra.

SA 4151. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4152. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4147. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

SA 4148. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by \$54,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by \$12,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by \$54,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by \$12,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

SA 4149. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 178, expressing the sympathy of the Senate to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the United States to work with Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes; as follows:

On page 5, strike line 7 through line 11, and insert the following:

(4) urges the Government of Guatemala to strengthen laws with respect to domestic violence and sexual harassment, to improve the integrity of the prosecutorial and judicial systems, and to provide the resources and commitment necessary to adequately enforce justice for crimes against women;

On page 5, insert "continue to" before "incorporate" in line 13.

On page 5, insert "continue to" after "encourages the Secretary of State to" in line 18.

On page 7, beginning in line 7, strike "all instances of improper investigatory methods" and insert "instances of failure to investigate and prosecute crimes".

SA 4150. Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 178, expressing the sympathy of the Senate to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the United States to work with Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes; as follows:

Strike the third whereas clause of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas, while the overall murder rate in Guatemala has increased substantially, the rate at which women have been murdered in Guatemala has increased at an alarming rate, almost doubling from 2001 to 2006;

SA 4151. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, line 18, after the word "program" insert "or increasing Federal student loan limits".

SA 4152. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, line 18, after the word "program" insert "or increasing Federal student loan limits".

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lindsey Miller of my office be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate on the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN U.S. AND THAILAND

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) commemorating the 175th anniversary of the commencement of the special relationship between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, that there be no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 66

Whereas 2008 marks the 175th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand in 1833, during President Andrew Jackson's administration

and the reign of King Rama III, and the commencement of the relationship between the two countries;

Whereas Thailand was the first treaty ally of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region and remains a steadfast friend with shared values of freedom, democracy, and liberty;

Whereas, in December 2003, the United States designated Thailand as a major ally outside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which improved the security of both countries, particularly by facilitating joint counterterrorism efforts;

Whereas, for more than a quarter century, Thailand has been the host country of Cobra Gold, the United States Pacific Command's annual multinational military training exercise, designed to ensure regional peace and promote regional security cooperation;

Whereas, in the wake of the tragic 2004 tsunami, the United States and Thailand launched joint relief operations from Utapao, Thailand, strengthening the overall capacity of the forces involved in providing relief and setting the model for effective humanitarian operations throughout the entire region affected by the deadly tsunami;

Whereas Thailand is a key partner of the United States in Southeast Asia and has supported closer relations between the United States and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations;

Whereas, on June 22, 2006, Congress agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 409, 109th Congress, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand;

Whereas, on December 5, 2007, the people of Thailand celebrated the 80th birthday of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej, the world's longest-serving monarch, who is loved and respected for his lifelong dedication to the social and economic development of the people of Thailand;

Whereas, on December 23, 2007, the Royal Thai Government held nationwide parliamentary elections that are paving the way for a successful return of democracy to Thailand;

Whereas approximately 500,000 people of Thai descent live in the United States, joining in the pursuit of the American Dream;

Whereas Thailand is the 20th largest trading partner of the United States, with bilateral trade totaling approximately \$30,600,000,000 per year; and

Whereas the bonds of friendship and mutual respect between the United States and Thailand are strong; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commemorates the 175th anniversary of relations between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand;

(2) offers sincere congratulations to the Kingdom of Thailand and the people of Thailand for the democratic, free, and fair elections held on December 23, 2007;

(3) commemorates the 80th birthday of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand and offers sincere congratulations and best wishes for the continued prosperity of the Kingdom of Thailand; and

(4) looks forward to continued, enduring ties of friendship between the peoples of Thailand and the United States.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2738 AND S. 2739

Mr. REID. It is my understanding there are two bills at the desk due for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2738) to identify and remove criminal aliens incarcerated in correctional facilities in the United States and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2739) to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for their second reading en bloc but I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

EXPRESSING THE SYMPATHY OF THE SENATE TO FAMILIES OF WOMEN AND GIRLS MURDERED IN GUATEMALA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) expressing the sympathy of the Senate to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the United States to work with Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at the desk be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the

preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4149) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 5, strike line 7 through line 11, and insert the following:

(4) urges the Government of Guatemala to strengthen laws with respect to domestic violence and sexual harassment, to improve the integrity of the prosecutorial and judicial systems, and to provide the resources and commitment necessary to adequately enforce justice for crimes against women;

On page 5, insert "continue to" before "incorporate" in line 13.

On page 5, insert "continue to" after "encourages the Secretary of State to" in line 18.

On page 7, beginning in line 7, strike "all instances of improper investigatory methods" and insert "instances of failure to investigate and prosecute crimes".

The amendment (No. 4150) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike the third whereas clause of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas, while the overall murder rate in Guatemala has increased substantially, the rate at which women have been murdered in Guatemala has increased at an alarming rate, almost doubling from 2001 to 2006;

The resolution (S. Res. 178), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2008

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate

completes its business today, it stand adjourned until tomorrow, March 11, at 10 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 70, the concurrent resolution on the budget. But the time, as we have already entered in the RECORD, until 2:15 is for debate only regarding the budget resolution—we have already gotten consent that the recess be from 12:30 to 2:15 for the weekly caucus lunches—and that all time during any morning business period count against the time allotted for the budget resolution. So that order has already been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:19 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 11, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING JUDGE WILLIAM NEALON ON THE OCCASION OF RECEIVING THE PRESIDENT'S AWARD FROM THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK OF LACKAWANNA COUNTY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to U.S. District Court Judge William J. Nealon who was chosen to receive the President's Award from the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania.

On December 15, 2007, Judge Nealon celebrated his 45th year as a United States District Court Judge. Appointed to the Federal bench by President John F. Kennedy on December 15, 1962, he was the youngest Federal judge in the country.

Judge Nealon served the Middle District as Chief Judge from 1976 until 1989. He has served on this court longer than any other judge in the history of the Middle District. Today, he is the third most tenured federal judge in the nation out of 1,100 federal jurists.

The proud product of Scranton Public Schools, he later served in the United States Marine Corps from 1942 to 1945 where he held the rank of first lieutenant. He received a bachelor of science degree in economics from Villanova University in 1947 and was awarded his Juris Doctor degree from the Catholic University of America in 1950. Prior to being appointed to the Federal bench, Judge Nealon served on the Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna County.

In 1983, the Association of Trial Lawyers of America, a professional society of more than 50,000 trial lawyers, named Judge Nealon the "Outstanding Federal Trial Judge in the United States." He has been the recipient of numerous community awards and has served as chairman of several local boards, including the University of Scranton, Mercy Hospital, and the Catholic Youth Center.

Having served as president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County some 44 years ago, his dinner in 1964 was regarded as one of the most memorable the society has ever held. Robert F. Kennedy, the United States Attorney General, made his first public appearance that evening just 4 months after the tragic assassination of his brother, President John F. Kennedy. Judge Nealon today is the most senior of distinguished past presidents of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Judge Nealon on this auspicious occasion. Judge Nealon's faithful service to his community and to his Nation is well known throughout northeastern and central Pennsylvania and has been an inspiration to all whose lives he has touched.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE OUACHITA PARISH SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Ouachita Parish School District for its designation as one of the top five school districts in the State of Louisiana, according to rankings recently released by the Department of Education.

As test scores throughout the Fifth Congressional District steadily climb each year, I believe the continued success of the Ouachita Parish School District stands as an example of hope and encouragement to other schools in the state who are striving to improve their current rankings.

The Fifth Congressional District has long struggled to overcome its status as one of the poorest regions in the country with an educational system that is often ranked very low. The achievements of the Ouachita Parish School District give me great hope that our region can defy its history.

When children excel in school, the transformation that takes place within their lives spills out beyond the walls of the classroom and into the community in which they live, and I believe the Ouachita Parish School District is stimulating such progress in North Louisiana.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring the efforts of the Ouachita Parish School District and its commitment to improving education and the quality of life in Ouachita Parish and throughout the State.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2008 VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JAMES MORAN to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Fairfax County Police Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that can be awarded to a public safety officer: the Life Saving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that we enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2008

Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Police Department. Receiving the Life Saving Award: Auxiliary Police Officer Jorge A. Canovas, Private First Class Jeremy T. Hoffman, Private First Class Jason J. Mardocco, Sergeant Andrew B. Wehrlein; Certificate of Valor: Private First Class Christopher L. Coleman, Private First Class Kirk A. McNickle, Private First Class Richard D. Shughart II, Private First Class Andrew L. Smuck, Private First Class Brooks R. Gillingham, Master Police Officer Mark P. Dale, Detective Gregory S. Bender; the Silver Medal: Private First Class Paul H. Bennett III, Officer Brian K. Bowman, Private First Class Kirk A. McNickle, Major Michael LoMonaco, Master Police Officer Gary S. Brown, Private First Class Daniel V. Johnson; the Bronze Medal: Rosemarie C. Silva.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Police Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. We ask our colleagues to join us in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 107 on motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on March 6, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to record my votes for rollcall Nos. 103–107.

Had I been present I would have voted: rollcall No. 103—"yes"—Providing for consideration of H.R. 2857, to reauthorize and reform the national service laws; rollcall No. 104—"yes"—Providing for consideration of H.R. 2857, to reauthorize and reform the national service laws; rollcall No. 105—"no"—Flake of Arizona Amendment; rollcall No. 106—"yes"—Inslee of Washington Amendment; rollcall No. 107—"yes"—Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education "GIVE" Act.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING THE HIGHLAND PARK GIRLS SWIMMING AND DIVING TEAM

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate the Highland Park Girls Swimming and Diving Team on winning the title of UIL 4A State Champions.

In his first year coaching at Highland Park, Jess Cole led the girls to their eighth consecutive win in the UIL Texas State Championship on Saturday, February 23, 2008. Those who competed at the State meet include Allison Arnold, Megan Arnold, Hannah Ferrin, Bolton Harris, Delaney Rolfe, Katy Streepey, Katy Tye, and Alex Weber. Their continued success can be attributed to their hard work, dedication, passion for swimming, and a strong sense of team spirit. In addition to claiming the title of State Champions, the Highland Park Girls Swimming and Diving Team now holds the longest State record in UIL swimming and diving, matching Class A Booker's record in girls golf as the longest in Texas high school sports since recordkeeping began in 1910.

Madam Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in congratulating the members of the Highland Park Girls Swimming and Diving Team for their well-deserved victory and wish them all the best in future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO NIAGARA COUNTY ON ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride and delight that I rise today to recognize and celebrate Niagara County on its 200th anniversary.

From the locks of the Erie Canal to the roar of Niagara Falls, and from its rich history to its wonderful and generous people, Niagara County has much to celebrate on its bicentennial.

The first settlers of this area were amazed and continually challenged by the geographic surprises that awaited them. The most well-known surprise is the 12,000-year-old Niagara Falls, which the early settlers looked upon as an unexplained phenomenon of nature. While the breathtaking, yet hazardous, Niagara Falls rushes 6 million cubic feet of water over its edges every minute during its daytime peak, the falls did stand still on March 29, 1848. An ice blockade on Lake Erie stopped the flow of water into the falls, allowing for an opportunity for people to explore the cliffs of Niagara Falls. The falls remains the largest attraction in Niagara County, attracting millions of tourists every year.

Niagara County was one of the pioneers in aviation with its "Grand Balloon Ascension" in July 1858. This display of aeronautical ingenuity brought crowds from all over Niagara County, and also many of the surrounding counties. While the balloon remained in the air

for just over 30 seconds, this display was seen as a huge accomplishment to the crowds that witnessed the event. The manufacturing and research center Bell Aerospace in the town of Wheatfield was instrumental in creating jobs in Niagara County. This plant is well-known around the world for its helicopters, rocket belts, and lunar modules. The rocket powered Bell X-1 supersonic aircraft that broke the sound barrier was piloted in 1947, by the renowned Chuck Yeager. This historic craft is now displayed in the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum.

Not only was Niagara County a leader in aviation, it was instrumental in the development and expansion of the telegraph machine and the telephone in western New York. Niagara County was the location of the second telegraph line in the United States. The line was constructed in 1845 and stretched all the way from Lockport to Buffalo. The telegraph line provided a service experienced by few up to this time in history. The first major message sent on this telegraph line was the results of the 1845 elections. The first telephone arrived in Niagara County in 1878, just 2 years after Alexander Graham Bell patented this invention. This telephone connected Cataract Bank with the home of the bank officer. People came from all over the county to view this life-altering invention.

This bicentennial should be a celebration of the residents of Niagara County past and present. The traditions of hard work and dedication have been instilled in this community. You can tell when you meet the people of Niagara County that they are all willing to lend a hand and help a neighbor.

Thus, Madam Speaker, in recognition of its rich history, innovation, and its wonderful residents, I ask that this honorable body join me in celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Niagara county.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2008 VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JAMES MORAN to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Vienna Police Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that can be awarded to a public safety officer: the Life Saving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that we enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2008 Valor Awards in the Vienna Police Department. Receiving the Life Saving Award: Sergeant Anthony R. Clingerman, Master Police Officer Jared B. Evans, Master Police Officer J. Michael Oliver, Master Police Officer H. Trent Nelson; the Silver Medal: Sergeant Anthony R. Clingerman.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Vienna Police Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. We ask our colleagues to join us in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 105 on H.R. 2857—GIVE Act, the Flake amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL FRANK DAY McMULLEN, JR., USN (RET.)

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, let me take this means to pay tribute to VADM Frank Day McMullen, Jr. A native of Kansas City, MO, he bravely served our country for 36 years in the United States Navy. Vice Admiral McMullen passed away on January 2, 2008.

Frank McMullen graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1947. He received his post-graduate degree from The George Washington University. He also attended the National War College and served as deputy assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy. Vice Admiral McMullen's extraordinary career led him to command one diesel electric and two nuclear powered submarines, the Submarine Squadron in the Holy Loch, Scotland, the Submarine Fortilla in New London, CT, and the Submarine Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet, in Pearl Harbor, HI.

Vice Admiral McMullen was very fortunate to have the love and understanding of his family who encouraged him, even when he left home to serve on lengthy deployments. He was preceded in death by his wife, Ruth, who passed away in November 2002, and his daughter Christine, who passed away in March 1994.

Vice Admiral McMullen truly loved his work and was very proud of his service to our country. I hope Members of the House will join me in honoring this outstanding Missourian, an extraordinary naval officer, and a wonderful husband, father, and friend.

CONDEMNING THE ONGOING PALESTINIAN ROCKET ATTACKS ON ISRAELI CIVILIANS

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this resolution because I believe we must condemn the

rocket attacks launched from Gaza into Israel. Many innocent persons, both Israeli and Palestinian, have been killed or injured in the violence. In addition to death and injury, the ongoing violence has destroyed property, instilled fear, and disrupted the lives of innocent civilians on both sides of the conflict.

I appreciate that the resolution helps document the toll that rocket attacks have exacted on Israeli civilians. But I very much regret that the resolution misses an important opportunity to acknowledge the complexity of problems and issues which give rise to the conflict. And I am particularly troubled that the resolution fails to recognize the depth and breadth of human suffering, misery, and death that has been visited upon the people of Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian situation in Gaza has only worsened since the armed takeover by Hamas in June 2007. Basic items such as baby milk, wheat grain, vegetable oil, and dairy products are in short supply. Additionally, the tightening of restrictions on the movement of goods and people by the Israeli government is causing serious hardship according to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, OCHA.

The OCHA has found that these restrictions have had the effect of preventing the people of Gaza from receiving desperately needed healthcare treatments like chemotherapy and radiation therapy for cancer patients, pediatric surgery, and neurosurgery. The restrictions on the movement of goods make it difficult for healthcare providers to obtain new diagnostic medical equipment or the parts to service existing equipment that has fallen into disrepair. To make matters worse, it appears that those Palestinians who want to leave Gaza to pursue treatment in Israel or abroad are finding it difficult to do so.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that humanitarian assistance is available and accessible to the people of Gaza is one of the most important steps that can be taken to ensure that the peace process succeeds and is not derailed by continued violence. It is for this reason that I recently wrote to Secretary of State Rice urging her to do all she can to make certain that vital humanitarian goods and services are successfully delivered in Gaza. I believe the moral force of the resolution would have been enhanced had it called for similar action.

Finally, this resolution cites the roles of Iran, Syria, and Egypt in enabling these attacks. I want to be clear that nothing recited in the resolution would justify a preemptive military response against these countries nor should it be used as grounds to build a case for such an action.

Mr. Speaker, the rocket attacks against Israel condemned by this resolution have caused great suffering to the victims. Acknowledging that suffering in a congressional resolution is a fitting and proper thing to do. But at the end of the day, the peace and justice we all seek will not come from passing a resolution in Congress. Rather, a just and lasting peace will come from the parties resolving in their hearts and minds to rededicate themselves to the active engagement in good faith negotiation to bring the two-state solution into being. I call upon the Administration to redouble its efforts in discharging its indispensable role as honest broker in the peace process.

HONORING DR. FREDERICK "SKIP" BERRIEN

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, for over three decades, Dr. Frederick "Skip" Berrien has been a prominent figure in Connecticut's medical, academic, and child welfare communities. This month, he will retire as the director for the Child Abuse/Children's Advocacy Center at St. Francis Hospital in Hartford, Connecticut. I rise today to recognize and celebrate his illustrious career and his contributions to our friends and neighbors in Connecticut.

Between 1980 and 1987, Dr. Berrien served as the director of pediatrics and acting medical director in general pediatrics at the UConn/Mount Sinai Health Center. Following his tenure at the UConn/Mount Sinai Health Center, Dr. Berrien assumed an associate director position for pediatric ambulatory services at Saint Francis Hospital. He subsequently served as director of pediatric ambulatory services, clinical director for sickle cell services, co-director of the Siberian American Children's Health Program, and director of child abuse services/Children's Advocacy Center at St. Francis. Beginning in 2001, Dr. Berrien joined the Connecticut Children's Medical Center as a consultant for the Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect Program.

While the size and scope of Skip's medical career is clear, his contributions to the academic and social services community have also been substantial. From 1977 to 1979, Dr. Berrien was a clinical instructor at Boston University and from 1980 until present, an associate professor of clinical pediatrics at UConn School of Medicine. His original research ranges from the state of Russian pediatric health care to pediatric sickle cell pain management. His work in Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union, established new, enduring partnerships with Russian doctors that has benefited both countries.

Dr. Berrien has added to his role of providing and teaching pediatric care, to serving as a forceful advocate for issues such as prevention of child abuse and neglect. In the early 1990's, he was instrumental with developing the Child Abuse/Children's Advocacy Center at St. Francis Hospital. At the time there was no program at all to deal with this critical unmet need in central Connecticut. Today as Dr. Berrien leaves, the center is one of the most respected such programs in the country and has brought both compassion and justice to this challenging area of law and medicine. In addition, Skip remains an active participant of such organizations as the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children, the International Society for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, and the Hartford Multidisciplinary Intervention Child Abuse Team.

Medical professionals serve an invaluable role in our society. They are protectors of public health, and purveyors of hope and social justice. Throughout his career, Dr. Berrien has exemplified each of these roles. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me and my constituents with recognizing his contributions and offering our warmest wishes for his retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2008 VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my Virginia colleagues, FRANK WOLF and JAMES MORAN, to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Herndon Police Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that can be awarded to a public safety officer: the Life Saving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that we enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2008 Valor Awards in the Herndon Police Department. Receiving the Certificate of Valor: Sergeant Stephen Thompson, Senior Police Officer James J. Passmore, Officer Adil Afab, and Officer Michael R. Croson.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Herndon Police Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. We ask our colleagues to join us in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 106 on H.R. 2857, GIVE Act, the Inslee Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING SCOTTS HILL LIONS CLUB

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Scotts Hill Lions Club as they celebrate their 60th anniversary.

The Scotts Hill Lions Club was chartered on March 30, 1948, due to the hard work and vision of Scott Hill's Mayor Erin Holland and Adamsville Lions' Club member Farris Stafford. As a chartered member, the Scotts Hill Lions Club became part of Lions Club International, which is the world's largest service club organization with more than 46,000 clubs in over 190 countries and approximately 1.4 million members.

Over the course of the last 60 years, the Scotts Hill Lions Club members have volunteered their time, energy, and resources to

supporting local charities, providing care for families in need, and have generously contributed towards relief efforts at home and in countries throughout the world. To say the least, the Scotts Hill Lions Club has undoubtedly lived out their club's motto, "We serve." I commend the members of the Scotts Hill Lions Club and encourage others to follow their example of dedication and service. Their hard work will not only be felt locally but around the world for years to come.

Please join me in honoring the Scotts Hill Lions Club, President Dan Brigrance, Secretary Pattie Stewart, and other officers and members in wishing them the best on this well-deserved anniversary.

HONORING JACQUELINE KONOPKA

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, volunteers who work on behalf of public safety officers thicken and strengthen the Thin Blue Line.

Tens of thousands of police officers daily risk the ultimate sacrifice in order to serve a greater good. These public servants have a friend behind the scenes working on their behalf in the Law Enforcement Assistance Connection Inc.

Today, I call the House's attention to Jacqueline Konopka, a 25-year-old constituent from Newnan in Georgia's Third Congressional District. Jackie has gone above and beyond to aid the Law Enforcement Assistance Connection.

A flight attendant for AirTran Airways, Jackie became involved with LEAC after meeting the organization's founder and leader on one of her flights. Terry Hunt's description of his work on behalf of law enforcement on that fateful flight won over a new and tireless volunteer. But Konopka says she's an easy sell when it comes to aiding public safety officials. "As a flight attendant," she says, "public safety is my No. 1 priority."

Today, Hunt sees Konopka's work as integral to his organization's mission: "Jacqueline Konopka has shown me the true meaning of life and inspired me to achieve and overcome personal and professional obstacles. A loyal friend and adviser, Jackie is someone I admire for her perseverance, leadership skills, drive and dedication in all she has done and continues to do. She is extremely special to me—in fact, it's not a stretch to say that had it not been for her willingness and selflessness to advance LEAC's goals, this organization would not function."

LEAC takes part in various activities to promote the welfare of law enforcement authorities, including the Annual Benefit for the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund Gala in Washington, the Annual Charitable Golf Classic to support the Law Enforcement Assistance Connection; and A Matter of Honor Annual Golf Event and Gala for the National Law Enforcement Museum in Washington.

Konopka helps plan and organize these events, but she describes her efforts on behalf of the LEAC as mainly "serving as a support for Terry." Nevertheless, she's breaking new

ground on her own by spearheading a "night out" for victims of violent crime. Konopka says she wants the event, planned for 2009 in Washington, to call attention to the fact that 1 out of 3 in this country are sexually assaulted at some point in their lives.

Madam Speaker, I hope the House will join me in thanking and congratulating Jacqueline Konopka and the Law Enforcement Assistance Connection Inc. for all that they give and all that they do to support the public servants who do so much for all Americans.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RAMAPO
COLLEGE DISTINGUISHED CITI-
ZENS DINNER 2008

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize four individuals who have been named by the Ramapo College Foundation Board of Governors as the 2008 Distinguished Citizens. This honor highlights their personal and professional commitment to advance higher education and their significant service to the community.

James E. Jaworski, Esq.; Patricia B. Shrader, Esq.; Drew Nieparent, and Edward P. Wallace, Jr. each support Ramapo College in their own unique ways while exemplifying the school's commitment to high standards of educational excellence.

In addition, these individuals are recognized for their dedication and unfailing commitment to our community. Our communities are only as strong as the people and organizations that are willing to put their time, effort, and energy into building them. I applaud Ramapo College for honoring these individuals and, in doing so, the true spirit of community that helps to make our country a symbol of strength and hope worldwide.

Ramapo College of New Jersey is located in Mahwah, New Jersey. Designated as "New Jersey's Public Liberal Arts College," Ramapo is a comprehensive institution of higher education whose faculty and staff dedicate themselves to the promotion of teaching and learning within a strong liberal arts based curriculum. Its curricular emphasis includes the liberal arts and sciences, social sciences, fine and performing arts, and the professional programs within a residential and sustainable living and learning environment.

It is an honor to represent such fine people and institutions in the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2008
VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JAMES MORAN to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Cham-

ber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that can be awarded to a public safety officer: the Life Saving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that we enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2008 Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. Receiving the Certificate of Valor: Acting Technician Ronald S. Seghetti, Firefighter Jason P. Kelly; the Gold Medal: Lieutenant Danny R. Urps, Master Technician John F. Linhart, Master Technician Joseph K. Swift, Firefighter Medic William F. Ward; the Silver Medal: Captain Richard C. Smith, Firefighter John A. Fleming; the Bronze Medal: Firefighter George H. Moore, Battalion Chief Floyd L. Ellmore, Firefighter Richard M. Tamillow.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. We ask our colleagues to join us in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

PAUL WELLSTONE MENTAL
HEALTH AND ADDICTION EQUITY
ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Despite the fact that 44 million Americans suffer from mental health disorders, a majority of health care plans continue to treat mental health differently than physical health. These plans discriminate against those with mental health disorders by imposing financial limitations and treatment restrictions on mental health and addiction care. Over 80 percent of Americans who need mental health treatment do not seek it because of the restrictions or the cost. This is unacceptable. Americans with mental health disorders need and deserve the same level of coverage as those who suffer from physical disorders, and with the passage of this bill, we can help give them that coverage.

This bill closes the loophole that has allowed plans to charge patients more and impose additional limits for mental health care. Efforts to weaken the bill by allowing plans to determine which mental health benefits to cover or preempting State laws providing stronger mental health protections will allow discrimination to continue against the millions of Americans who need our support in their efforts to seek treatment.

I urge everyone to vote for H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act, and these people whose lives depend on the treatment they need and deserve. Members of Congress have mental health parity. It's high time we provide parity to the 44 million Americans who need it.

PAUL WELLSTONE MENTAL
HEALTH AND ADDICTION EQUITY
ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act of 2007.

As a society, we must fight for the rights of people who seek mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Vulnerable individuals with mental illnesses continue to face numerous barriers when seeking care, and we must work together to remove these barriers especially for diverse communities.

Latinos already have lower rates of employer-sponsored health insurance and lower rates of insurance with mental health coverage.

In California, 77 percent of Latinos' mental health treatment was covered by their insurance, compared to 85 percent of Whites.

The Supplement to the Report of the Surgeon General on Mental Health found that

Latinos with mental disorders underutilize mental health services.

Fewer than 1 in 11 Latinos with a mental disorder seeks help with a mental health specialist.

We must do more to help people with mental health disorders and addiction.

I hope that mental health parity will help reduce barriers to their care, such as coverage, stigma and discrimination to mental health care.

We cannot let insurers continue to discriminate against which diagnoses should be covered and which ones are not.

We should not compromise our efforts to stop the persistent discrimination in our mental health and substance abuse health care system.

This bill is a step forward for people who suffer from mental illnesses and for their families, but we in Congress must do more to enable the millions of Americans to receive the mental health care they need and deserve.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this landmark legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2008
VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JAMES MORAN to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Two Members of the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that can be awarded to a public safety officer: the Life Saving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that we enter into the RECORD the names of the recipients of the 2008 Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office. Receiving the Certificate of Valor: First Lieutenant Tyler D. Corey and Private First Class Michael W. Ittner.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. We ask our colleagues to join us in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

COMMENDING THE LSU COLLEGE
OF EDUCATION FOR REACHING
ITS CENTENNIAL

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Louisiana State University (LSU) College of Education for reaching its centennial.

Since its establishment, the college has prepared thousands of educational leaders, including supervisors, principals, superintendents, and university faculty and administrators.

Originally named the "Teachers' College," the LSU College of Education employed two faculty members at its founding in 1908. In 1939, the college expanded to include the School of Health & Physical Education, presently named the Department of Kinesiology. This department, initially focused on teacher education, has now expanded to include nationally and internationally recognized research and scholarship programs that generate and disseminate knowledge about all aspects of the art and science of human movement.

These days the college is a collaborative unit that prepares educational and wellness professionals. With oversight responsibilities for various professional certification programs spanning four colleges and one school, the college also oversees the K-12 University Laboratory School, which has been ranked among the nation's top 2.5 percent of public high schools by Newsweek as well as boasts the state's first international baccalaureate program.

The LSU College of Education today employs more than 200 faculty and professional staff to provide rigorous academic programs, highlighted by challenging, rich and collaborative experiences.

To celebrate the 100th birthday of the college, the LSU College of Education is hosting a series of events throughout the 2008-2009 anniversary year, including a kick-off centennial celebration, special lecture series, visiting scholars, and nationwide alumni celebrations.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the LSU College of Education for reaching this landmark year.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF MS. KAY BEARD

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Kay Beard, Wayne County Commissioner and dedicated community advocate, upon her retirement from a distinguished 30-year career in public service.

Kay became interested in politics at an early age at the knee of her grandmother who used to host meetings of the local congressional delegation in their Detroit home. Throughout her life, Kay was active in civic and community organizations, but did not run for political office until 1972 when she launched an unsuccessful bid for State representative. Undeterred, Kay ran for Wayne County commissioner in 1976, Kay was later appointed to fill a vacancy on the Wayne County Commission in April 1978. Subsequently, Kay never failed to win another election she ran in including her most recent reelection in 2006 to her 15th term. Her 30 years on the commission made her the longest serving member ever.

While managing the daily tasks of a county commissioner, Kay gave back a tremendous amount of time and effort to her community. Kay served on the National Advisory Council for School-to-Work Opportunities, the Senior Advisory Council of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, the United Way Community Services Board of Directors, and was a founding member of Hospices of Michigan. Her efforts did not go unnoticed by the citizens of Michigan. The Michigan Democratic Women's Caucus presented her with its highest honor, the Eleanor Roosevelt Award. She was also a recipient of the Westland ATHENA Award and in honor of her achievements has had a building on the grounds of the Eloise Psychiatric Hospital renamed the Kay Beard Building.

During her 15 terms on the Wayne County Board of Commissioners, Ms. Beard has dealt with issues ranging from the termination of the drain commissioner's job, a failed smoking ban, the creation of an antifraud law, and a valiant yet unsuccessful attempt to save Wayne County General Hospital. Ms. Beard felt that spirited opposition was the touchstone of democracy. Despite displaying a vibrant spirit, Kay has been ordered by her doctor to step down for health reasons. Her loss will be felt by all the citizens of Wayne County who wish her nothing but happiness.

Madam Speaker, for 30 years Commissioner Kay Beard has faithfully served Michigan and Wayne County. As she enters the next phase of her life, she leaves behind a legacy of dedication, integrity, and excellence. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Commissioner Kay Beard upon her retirement and recognizing her years of loyal service to our community and country.

CONGRATULATING THE HASTINGS
ST. CECILIA BLUEHAWKS

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, Today, I want to congratulate the Hastings St. Cecilia Bluehawks on winning the Nebraska Class C-I Boys Basketball Championship on Saturday, March 8, 2008.

In a game dominated by the defense, the Bluehawks finished ahead of previously unbeaten Bennington by a score of 50 to 43—all the more remarkable when you consider the score was only 24–22 at the beginning of the fourth quarter.

Both teams deserve congratulations for finishing a great year. As one of the Bluehawks' coaches remarked, "This group can do anything they want to do when they put their minds to it."

I think that phrase can be used to sum up all of the great athletes who dedicated themselves this year, whether they made the championship game or not.

THE SUZANNE McDANIEL PUBLIC
AWARENESS AWARD

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, Suzanne McDaniel is one of the "Old Buffalos," which is what we call the first advocates in the victims' rights field. I met Suzanne 25 years ago, when I was a judge on the Harris County District Court. Suzanne worked as the director of the Witness Office of the Harris County District Attorney's Office. She was one of the first prosecutor-based victim advocates in Texas and in the entire country. Since then, Suzanne has tirelessly crusaded for crime victims at the local, State and national levels.

Suzanne began working in the trenches, in the days when victims were looked at as mere witnesses in a trial. In Harris County, Texas, Suzanne helped create the first community interagency council on sexual assault and family violence. Suzanne then went to work for the State of Texas in the Governor's office. There she wrote groundbreaking reports on crime victims and organized conferences to train and educate victims, advocates, and allied professions.

Suzanne then brought her knowledge, dedication, and leadership to the Texas State Attorney General's office where she was the State's crime victim information officer. In this position, Suzanne advocated for the passage of legislative and regulatory initiatives, including the passage of Texas' State constitutional amendment for victims. As a testament to Suzanne's significant contributions to the victims' field, the State coalition of victim organizations, VOTERS, appointed her as legislative liaison.

Not only has Suzanne tirelessly advocated for crime victims in Texas, but she brought the same drive and compassion to the national level. In 1984, when President Ronald Reagan created the President's Task Force on Victims

of Crime, Suzanne coordinated field hearings that launched victims' rights into a national concern. In addition, Suzanne served on the board of the National Organization for Victim Assistance for 10 years.

When I came to Congress, I founded the Congressional Victim's Rights Caucus to provide a voice for and to advocate on behalf of crime victims. The Caucus honors individuals, organizations, and advocates that have truly made a difference for crime victims. Instead of honoring Suzanne's contributions with an award, the Caucus has named an award after her, to forever honor her work, dedication, and compassion. On April 9, 2008, the Congressional Victim's Rights Caucus will present its first "Suzanne McDaniel Public Awareness Award." And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS J.
GRAFF

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas J. Graff, senior counsel to the Environmental Defense Fund of California. His more than 35 years as a leader in California's environmental and water communities is to be commended, a service that he has performed with intelligence, passion, and humor.

Tom joined the California bar after receiving graduate degrees from the London School of Economics and Harvard Law School. In 1971, Tom founded the first California office of the Environmental Defense Fund. The modern environmental movement was in its infancy, but Tom Graff learned quickly.

Tom worked hard to reform California water policy, particularly in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Working closely with colleagues, allies and adversaries, Tom contributed to projects such as Mono Lake, Imperial Valley, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, CVPIA, and the 1994 Bay-Delta Accord. His efforts in protecting California water resources led to his service on the Colorado River Board, where he worked with Californians and water advocates from throughout the Colorado River basin. A consistent thread in his environmental and water advocacy was economic solutions to complex environmental problems.

Tom Graff's influence crossed over into other aspects of California's environment and economy as well. In the 1980s, he launched efforts to address acid rains and transportation issues. Governor Pete Wilson appointed Tom to the Commission on Transportation Investment, where Tom participated in infrastructure issues.

While the law is, by nature, adversarial, Tom's gifted advocacy has gained him the respect and admiration of many, even those considered his adversaries. Many testify to Tom's practice of active listening in order to genuinely understand his adversaries' interests. This often resulted in solutions that resolved both sides' concerns. In sometimes tense negotiations, Tom was known to insert humor as well as perspective to smooth the way toward resolving potentially intense conflicts. Tom spoke accurately when he said, "We cannot repeat the water wars of the past." "We have to find a way to work together, or we will all lose."

Tom's contributions to California's environmental community have been public and political, as well as private and personal. Tom has served as a lecturer at law schools at the University of California—Berkeley and Harvard. His constant practice of mentoring junior colleagues and law students has been spoken highly of.

In everything that Tom Graff has aspired to do, he has helped broaden Californians' understanding of the challenges of balancing environmental and economic concerns, and the use of California's natural resources. It is that effort that I recognize before you today.

SEVEN KILLED IN SHOOTING AT
JERUSALEM SEMINARY

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, last Thursday was a tragic day in Jerusalem. An "act of terror and depravity" as Secretary Rice defined it, took the lives of eight young students, while gathering to have dinner.

At 8:45 pm, Thursday night, two terrorists infiltrated to a Jewish seminary in Jerusalem and opened fire in a dining hall. The shooting was continuing for a few minutes until police forces arrived and the gunmen were stopped. Eight students were killed and seven others were wounded and are still hospitalized.

Mercatz Harav Seminary is a center for studying of Judaism that is located in Kiryat Moshe quarter at the entrance of the city. The seminary holds around 500 students, including foreigners, some of them Americans. In this specific evening there were about 80 people in the dining hall when the gunmen opened fire.

The victims are Neria Cohen, 15 years old; Segev Paniel Avihail, 15 years old; Yehonathan Ytzchak Eldar, 16 years old; Avraham David Moses, 16 years old; Roy Rot, 18 years old; Yochai Lifshitz, 18 years old; Yehonadav Haim Hirshfeld, 19 years old; and Doron Mahareta, 26 years old.

I urge my colleagues to come together and find ways to resolve the conflict in the Middle East.

I would also like to express my deep sorrow for the loss of the young students. To the parents and families of the victims, I offer my sincerest condolences, and grant the families comfort and peace at this time.

HONORING MARTIN'S MILL LADY
MUSTANGS FOR WINNING THE
CLASS A DIVISION I TEXAS
STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Martin's Mill Lady Mustangs basketball team for winning the Class A Division I Texas State Championship.

On March 2, 2008, the Lady Mustangs made their third straight appearance in the State tournament since they secured their first championship title in 2006. After trading leads

throughout the game and trailing late in the third quarter, the Lady Mustangs came back to secure a 48–43 victory over Sudan.

I especially want to recognize the three seniors on the team, Jordan Barncastle, Taylor Daniel and Christa Williams, for the extraordinary achievement of securing two State championships. In addition, I want to congratulate Jordan Barncastle for being named the tournament's Most Valuable Player after contributing 18 points, eight rebounds, and three steals in the championship game.

I also want to recognize Head Coach Doug Barncastle, who began coaching at Martin's Mill High School in 2005 and has led the Lady Mustangs to the State tournament all 3 years. This victory was extra special since he was coaching his daughter, Jordan Barncastle, in her last game before graduating and heading to Lubbock to play for the Texas Tech Lady Raiders. With the game falling during the week of his birthday, the victory was an answered birthday wish for Coach Barncastle.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize the Martin's Mill Lady Mustangs—both coaches and players—for their talent, dedication, and exceptional performance.

CONGRATULATING THE BOROUGH OF RAMSEY, NEW JERSEY, ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate the borough of Ramsey, New Jersey, on its centennial celebration. Today, March 10, is the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of Ramsey.

Ramsey is located at the foothills of the Ramapo Mountains in northeast New Jersey and covers 5.9 square miles. Dutch, English, Scottish, and German settlers were among the first colonists to live in Ramsey. The Old Stone House was built as a Dutch colonial farmhouse in the 1700s, and it is still preserved today. A gristmill was erected in the mid 1780s, and six decades later a railroad station was assembled—both brought commerce and development to the area. Ramsey quickly became known as the strawberry capital, due to the large amounts of strawberries grown in the region and then shipped to other States.

Today, Ramsey is the site of six churches, three parks, four public schools, and a public library. Several scenes from The Sopranos episode "The Happy Wander" were shot at the Maple Shade Motel, and Ramsey was also a setting for scenes from the 2006 film World Trade Center. Several notable Americans have resided in Ramsey, including Ryan Grant, running back for the Green Bay Packers; Danny Aiello, a stage and film star; and Ryan McGinley, a photographer. Perhaps the most distinguished resident to call Ramsey "home" was Army Master Sergeant Charles Ernest Hosking, who received a Medal of Honor for self-sacrificially saving the lives of several of his commanders during the Vietnam war.

The borough of Ramsey is rich with historical, cultural, educational, and recreational in-

stitutions. For 100 years, Ramsey has been the cherished residence of many Americans. It is my hope that the borough of Ramsey will continue to be a vibrant community for many years to come.

CONGRATULATING PERKINS COUNTY PLAINSMEN ON WINNING CLASS C-2B NEBRASKA GIRLS BASKETBALL STATE TITLE

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Perkins County Plainsmen on their 62 to 49 victory over Sutton to take the Class C-2B Nebraska Girls Basketball State Title on March 1, 2008. They embody the spirit of teamwork, determination, and heart, which champions display.

They finished the season unbeaten, but definitely not untested. Sutton, who allowed an average of just 35 points a game this season, gave the Plainsmen all they could handle, but came up short.

So, it is with a sense of pride that I congratulate the Perkins County Plainsmen girls' basketball team on winning this championship. This victory is the result of months and years of hard work by the players, students, and their coaches.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING EARL LLOYD FOR BECOMING THE FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN TO PLAY IN THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION LEAGUE

SPEECH OF

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Representative JIM MORAN's House resolution expressing the sense of Congress to recognize and honor Earl Lloyd for breaking the color barrier as the first African-American to play in the National Basketball Association (NBA).

In addition to Earl Lloyd's accomplishments during the 1950 season, I want to take this opportunity to also recognize the Boston Celtics franchise and legendary coach and general manager Red Auerbach for their work in the advancement and inclusion of African-Americans in the NBA.

In 1950, before Earl Lloyd became the first African-American to play in an NBA game, Chuck Cooper became the first African-American to be drafted in the NBA by the Boston Celtics in the second round of the selection process. This milestone was the first in a long list of accomplishments the Celtics organization has made during their storied history to break down the color barrier in professional sports.

In addition to drafting the first African-American player, Red Auerbach was also the first to have an all African-American starting lineup which included Bill Russell, Willie Naulls, Tom Sanders, Sam Jones and K. C. Jones. In the

1966–67 season, the Celtics would go a step further by making Bill Russell the first African-American to coach an NBA team.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me today in honoring Earl Lloyd, Chuck Cooper and all the individuals who were a part of breaking down the color barrier in professional sports.

RECOGNIZING EILEEN MCGUCKIAN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my appreciation and gratitude to Eileen McGuckian, founder of Peerless Rockville, for her 35 years of service to the cause of historic preservation.

Eileen was driven to take action in 1974, when she witnessed the demolition of the historic and beautiful Masonic Lodge in Rockville. Along with a group of like-minded community members, she formed Peerless Rockville and began raising money for the preservation of historic buildings and sites and educating the public on the importance of protecting our shared history.

Peerless Rockville has become a model of public-private partnership, whose successes have included the rescue and preservation of the 1873 B&O Railroad Station, the Montrose School and Baptist Cemetery, the Dawson farmhouse, the Grand Courtroom of the Red Brick Courthouse, and Wire Hardware, one of the few examples of 19th century commercial architecture remaining in Rockville. In addition, Peerless Rockville fulfills its educational mission by providing walking tours and history programs, and maintaining an impressive collection of maps, historic photographs, architects' drawings and other documents. These documents are an invaluable resource for local residents, students and scholars. Eileen herself made full use of this collection in her award-winning book, *Rockville: Portrait of a City*. Today, Rockville is a richer and more beautiful place thanks to Eileen McGuckian.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing and honoring Eileen McGuckian for 35 years of dedicated and outstanding service to the city of Rockville and to Montgomery County, Maryland.

CONDEMNING THE ONGOING PALESTINIAN ROCKET ATTACKS ON ISRAELI CIVILIANS

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I rise to explain the reasons and the scruples that led me to vote "present" on H. Res. 951.

I would note, first, that the resolution as amended and passed is more acceptable to me than the original draft. Most important to me is that the amended resolution recognizes the suffering of innocent victims on both sides of the conflict. However, I continue to believe that resolutions containing language such as

some of the language in H. Res. 951 do not advance us towards the most important goal relative to this issue: peaceful co-existence for the region.

The resolution properly states America's support for the people of Israel and their right to defend themselves. It notes the near daily rocket and mortar attacks on southern Israel that have been launched from the Gaza Strip since Israel withdrew from Gaza in the interests of peace in 2005. It fairly condemns Hamas and other terrorist organizations. I have never wavered in my support for Israel's right to defend itself against terrorists. I approved their action against the Iraqi nuclear site. I was bitterly criticized for my defense of the "targeted assassination" of Sheikh Yassin in 2004. I led the resistance in the city of Somerville to a campaign to divest in Israel. I am a friend of Israel and I do not believe this resolution makes Israel safer. It fails to reconfirm our commitment to peace and to a process that can bring about peace. I believe this failure renders America less able to be an effective broker for peace in the region.

In addition, I question the desirability and wisdom of reiterating the status of Iran and Syria as "state sponsors of terror". The Department of State has so listed them and, certainly, there is ample evidence that both countries have actively and passively provided aid and comfort to Hamas and also to Hizbollah. Certainly, the current leaders of Iran have publicly stated their vile opinions about Israel and their determination to eradicate it. No one can deny these facts. Nonetheless, I have always been of the opinion that finding a way to peace is more important than name calling—even if the names seem to be well-deserved. I believe that those who are truly committed to finding a peaceful solution—two democratic states, recognized by other nations and coexisting in peace—must not succumb to the temptation of name-calling. We cannot let terrorists shape our agenda. We must remain determined to pursue peace.

I would ask anyone whether they are more or less likely to open their ears so they can hear their opponent if that opponent constantly calls them names. I would ask anyone whether they are more or less likely to believe that someone who calls them names can truly understand their concerns. We all suffer from the same human weakness that causes us to lash out at those who attack us. This is a natural and understandable emotional reaction. However, it is one that we must resist, especially when engaging in what should be seen as deliberative and thoughtful endeavors such as Congressional resolutions.

That said, I believe every observer agrees that Egypt and Syria must be active participants in resolving this conflict. Many might agree that Iran must participate as well—or at least acquiesce. How then does it encourage them to do so when the Congress states or implies that they are to blame for the problems in the region? This question seems particularly relevant because the resolution, a condemnation of Hamas rocket attacks and an expression of solidarity with the people of Israel does not require us to condemn other regional powers. There is no need to "poke our finger in the eye" of governments able to thwart or advance a peaceful solution.

I would point out that the Congress has taken this approach for years. We have passed numerous resolutions—too many, in

my view, that are gratuitously confrontational. I ask: Have those resolutions moved us any closer to finding a peaceful solution? The approach has not worked thus far and I see no reason to believe it will start working now.

I voted "present" rather than "no" because I was in sympathy with much of the resolution. I voted as a Member of Congress determined that the United States act responsibly in pursuit of peace.

HONORING JOHNNIE BENDY FOR
RECEIVING THE LIFETIME
ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Johnnie Bendy for receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Mineola Chamber of Commerce.

Johnnie Bendy, named after her father who passed away weeks before she was born, is known for the impact she has made in her community. Ms. Bendy's grandmother and elderly neighbors influenced her love for nature and education by taking her fishing, teaching her to identify medicinal herbs, and explaining the intricacies of nature. Being raised by a single mother in the 1930s inevitably led to difficult times, and Ms. Bendy recalls going hungry for days.

After attending grade school in Mineola, Ms. Bendy worked to pay her way through school at Texas College. After graduating, Ms. Bendy taught at McFarland School until 1964 when she began her career as a librarian at Mineola Middle School, a post she held for 38 years.

In addition to teaching, Ms. Bendy devoted her time volunteering and serving on the city planning and zoning commission, the Kindness Cottage, the Mineola Chamber of Commerce, the Community Chest, United Way, the East Texas Council of Government, and is a former president of Friends of the Library. Ms. Bendy has been recognized both locally and nationally as a Distinguished Teacher, Volunteer of the Year, and 1998 Woman of the Year.

In 2007, Mineola Mayor Pete Smith dedicated a historical marker to Ms. Bendy in the Mineola Nature Preserve on the Sabine River that now marks a trail leading to the International & Great Northern Rail Road where she spent her childhood playing outdoors.

In the midst of all this activity, Ms. Bendy sang in her church choir and devoted time to organizing and serving on various church committees.

Ms. Bendy's perseverance and selfless attitude in the face of cumbersome obstacles qualifies her to receive this lifetime achievement award. Her work helped Mineola become a better place to live, work, raise a family, and realize the American dream.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize Johnnie Bendy for earning the Lifetime Achievement Award and for sharing her passions to inspire those around her.

TRIBUTE TO CLEORA MAGEE

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Cleora Magee as she retires as the executive director of the city of Flint Human Relations Commission. A celebration will be held in her honor on Saturday, March 15 in my hometown of Flint, Michigan.

Cleora Magee has served the people of the Flint area for many years. After working in the registrar's office at Mott Community College, Cleora became a community organizer at the Urban Coalition of Greater Flint. She went on to work at the Flint Neighborhood Improvement and Preservation Project, Incorporated, as a Community Organizer, and a Neighborhood Service Center manager. In 1996 she became the executive director of the city of Flint Human Relations Commission.

In her capacity as the executive director, Cleora has touched the lives of thousands of people. She serves many organizations and is affiliated with the following: secretary for the board of the Fair Winds Girl Scout Council; secretary of the board of the Flint Neighborhood Improvement and Preservation Project, Incorporated; secretary for the board of the Flint Neighborhood Coalition; a member of the board of directors and chairperson of the Michigan Outstate Chapter of the National Association of Human Rights Workers; member of the board and mediator with the Community Resolution Center; Member of the Advisory Board of YouthBuild; the Mayor's Representative on the Emergency Food and Shelter Program Local Board and Allocations Committee; a member of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; a member of Flint Rotary; the chairperson of the Sponsorship Committee for the National Multicultural Diversity Institute; co-chairperson of the Community Response Committee with the Michigan Alliance Against Hate Crimes; a member of the Hurley Medical Center Bioethics Committee; a member of the M.L. King, Jr. Annual Tribute Planning Committee; a member of the Genesee County Committee for Community Peace; a member of Community Challenge Visual Change Group; a member of the city of Flint Threat Assessment Team; the coordinator of the city of Flint Employee Combined Charitable Campaign; a member of the United Way of Genesee County Strengthening Families System of Care; a member of the New Immigrant Services Coalition of MidMichigan; a member of the Kwanzaa Committee; the secretary for Unification for Urban Equality; a member of the Donald Riegle Annual Service Award Event Committee; a member of the Community Outreach for Family and Youth Steering Committee; a member of the McCree Special Groups Committee; the African American Heritage Collaborative Committee; the Youth Violence Prevention Coalition; and the city of Flint Emergency Evacuation Committee.

Cleora is married to Percy Magee. She has four children and three stepchildren. She received her bachelor's degree from Central Michigan University in Community Development. Cleora attends True Gospel Missionary Baptist Church where she serves as deaconess.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating

Cleora Magee on her career of service to the people of Flint, Michigan. The community is losing a great advocate and I wish her the best as she enjoys her well deserved retirement.

IN HONOR OF THE MONTEREY PENINSULA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce. The Monterey Chamber of Commerce was created in 1908 from a loosely organized merchants' association. In 1949, the name was changed to reflect its expansion across the entire peninsula including the sister cities of Carmel, Pacific Grove, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Seaside, and Sand City as well as the neighboring unincorporated areas of Big Sur, Carmel Valley, Carmel Highlands and Pebble Beach.

Today, a chamber is more than a non-profit organization; it is a business, and its product is its members. As the largest chamber of commerce in the tri-county area, it provides leadership on issues, programs and business development that benefit both the community and their member businesses.

Now 1,000 members strong, the chamber's commitment to serving the business interests of the entire peninsula strengthens economic growth, promotes the wonders of Monterey County, and serves the needs of our many visitors annually from around the world.

In answer to the question, "What has the Chamber done for me lately?" Board chair Terry Low and president and CEO Astrid Coleman offer these programs and goals: promoting its members by making each one aware of local products and services and creating events to showcase the members; offering educational programs, coaching services and forums to help small business owners succeed; and presenting a "voice for business" to legal and legislative authorities about issues affecting peninsula business and the community. Recognizing the need for a properly prepared workforce, the chamber mobilizes business and community resources to

ensure quality education on the Monterey Peninsula, and is dedicated to sustainability through the local greening of businesses.

Madam Speaker, I salute 100 years of effort by the members, volunteers, committee members, board members, community partners, and staff of the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, whose dedication has made this organization a vital and integral part of our community.

CONGRATULATING EWING TIGERS GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Ewing Tigers girls basketball team for winning the 2008 Nebraska State Girls Basketball Class D-2 Championship by the score of 45-44 last week, just barely edging the Pleasanton Bulldogs.

The returning champs from 2007—who went 0-19 just three years ago—found their salvation on the foul line, making three of four free throws with just 23 seconds to go in the game. A coach I know once said that if you make your free throws, you win the game. Well, the girls from Ewing certainly proved him right.

The players showed grit and determination during their championship game, but also dedication, teamwork and responsibility during the regular season to get them to the final game. They should be proud of their accomplishments, as I'm sure their entire community is of them.

I hope the girls and their coaches are as proud of themselves as we are of them. They deserve a well earned break, and I look forward to following their season next year.

HONORING SUZANNE LINDLEY FOR HER DEDICATION TO HELPING OTHERS FIGHT CANCER

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Suzanne Lindley for her

dedication to inspiring cancer patients and survivors and for courageously fighting her own battle against colorectal cancer.

In 1998, after receiving a bleak diagnosis that she had advanced metastatic colorectal cancer, Mrs. Lindley reached out to fellow patients in an attempt to gain emotional and medical support. Nine years later, thousands are looking to Mrs. Lindley for inspiration. In addition to being involved in eight different associations, Mrs. Lindley is a co-founder and president of Yttrium-90 Microspheres Education and Support, and serves on the Colorectal Cancer Coalition steering committee for Cover Your Butt. Mrs. Lindley also works with the American Cancer Society as the online chair for Van Zandt County Relay for Life, the ACT District 5 chair, a Cancer Action Network member, and a Cancer Support Network member.

Through her own experience, Mrs. Lindley learned the importance of support groups for both patients suffering with cancer and their families. But rather than focusing on herself, Mrs. Lindley organized survivor advocacy to support cancer patients.

With a desire to bring hope to others, Mrs. Lindley took her personal story to the national stage and courageously shared it with magazines, radio and television hosts. During her appearance on the TODAY Show, Katie Couric referred to her as a "Medical Matchmaker" for promoting the "buddy system" while fighting this disease.

Today, I have the privilege of meeting with Mrs. Lindley. However, this is not Mrs. Lindley's first trip to Washington, DC. Desiring to take a proactive approach, Mrs. Lindley has spent much time with lawmakers, both back home and in Washington, to petition Congress for their help in the fight against cancer.

Cancer is a devastating disease that has touched many lives. As a former volunteer and board member of the American Cancer Society of Dallas, I have seen how cancer impacts a family. As a husband and father, I share a deep commitment to the fight against cancer.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize Suzanne Lindley for her selfless spirit in the face of a consuming disease.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 11, 2008, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To receive a briefing on the current readiness of the armed forces of the United States.

SH-219

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and conduct oversight.

SD-538

Finance

To hold hearings to examine alternatives to the current federal estate tax system.

SD-215

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider H.R. 3247, to improve the provision of disaster assistance for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, H.R. 3179, to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the use of Federal supply schedules for the acquisition of law enforcement, security, and certain other related items by State and local governments, S. 2606, to reauthorize the United States Fire Administration, S. 789, to prevent abuse of Government credit cards, S. 2291, to enhance citizen access to Government information and services by establishing plain language as the standard style of Government documents issued to the public, S. 2420, to encourage the donation of excess food to nonprofit organizations that provide assistance to food-insecure people in the United States in contracts entered into by executive agencies for the provision, service, or sale of food, S. 2534, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Julia M. Carson Post Office Building", H.R. 4210, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Washington Avenue in Weldon, North Carolina, as the "Dock M. Brown Post

Office Building", H.R. 4342, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 824 Manatee Avenue West in Bradenton, Florida, as the "Dan Miller Post Office Building", S. 2725, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the "Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office", H.R. 3720, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 Clay Avenue in Waco, Texas, as the "Army PFC Juan Alonso Covarrubias Post Office Building", H.R. 3988, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3701 Altamesa Boulevard in Fort Worth, Texas, as the "Master Sergeant Kenneth N. Mack Post Office Building", H.R. 4211, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 725 Roanoke Avenue in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, as the "Judge Richard B. Allsbrook Post Office", H.R. 4240, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10799 West Alameda Avenue in Lakewood, Colorado, as the "Felix Sparks Post Office Building", S. 2622, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "William 'Bill' Clay Post Office", S. 2626 and H.R. 5400, bills to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 160 East Washington Street in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, as the "Sergeant Michael M. Kashkoush Post Office Building", H.R. 3468, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1704 Weeksville Road in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "Dr. Clifford Bell Jones, Sr. Post Office", H.R. 3532, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5815 McLeod Street in Lula, Georgia, as the "Private Johnathon Millican Lula Post Office", H.R. 4203, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3035 Stone Mountain Street in Lithonia, Georgia, as the "Specialist Jamaal RaShard Addison Post Office Building", H.R. 5135, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Greenway Street in Derby, Kansas, as the "Sergeant Jamie O. Maugans Post Office Building", and the nomination of Harvey E. Johnson, Jr., of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine issues relative to in-person voter fraud and voter disenfranchisement.

SR-301

Armed Services

Strategic Forces Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine strategic forces programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 and the future years defense program.

SR-232A

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Air Force.

SD-192

Aging

To hold hearings relative to doctors and prescription drug information and reviews.

SD-562

1:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Interstate Commerce, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the gross domestic product as a measurement of national strength.

SR-253

2 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine Generation Rx, focusing on the abuse of prescription and over-the-counter drugs.

SD-226

Armed Services

SeaPower Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009, for the strategic lift programs, and the future years defense program.

SR-222

2:15 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine hardrock mining, focusing on issues relating to abandoned mine lands and uranium mining.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the United States and Vietnam, focusing on the bilateral relationship.

SD-419

Armed Services

Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine technologies to combat weapons of mass destruction.

SD-106

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine agencies in peril, focusing on protecting federal information technology and secure sensitive information.

SD-342

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009, the future years defense program, and military installation, environmental, and base closure programs.

SR-232A

Intelligence

Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-219

4 p.m.

Appropriations

Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the federal judiciary.

SD-138

MARCH 13

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 for the United States European

Command and the United States African Command, and the future years defense program.

SH-216

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 2731, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and the nominations of William Raymond Steiger, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique, and Mark Kimmitt, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, both of the Department of State.

S-116, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine old-growth forest science, focusing on policy and management in the Pacific Northwest region.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the financial state of the airline industry.

SR-253

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation.

SD-192

Finance

To hold hearings to examine customs reauthorization, focusing on strengthening United States economic interests and security.

SD-215

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 2136, to address the treatment of primary mortgages in bankruptcy, S. 2133, to authorize bankruptcy courts to take certain actions with respect to mortgage loans in bankruptcy, S. 2041, to amend the False Claims Act, S. 2533, to enact a safe, fair, and responsible state secrets privilege Act, S. 702, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to State courts to develop and implement State courts interpreter programs, S. Res. 468, designating April 2008 as "National 9-1-1 Education Month", and the nominations of Catharina Haynes, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and Rebecca A. Gregory,

to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas.

SD-226

Appropriations

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-138

2p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold a hearing to examine the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

SR-253

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 for the current readiness of the armed forces, and the future years defense program.

SR-232A

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and the Proliferation Security Initiative at the Department of Defense, and nuclear nonproliferation programs at the National Security Administration, and the future years defense program.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Fisheries and Coast Guard Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

SR-253

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine Poland's Museum of the History of Polish Jews.
B318, Rayburn Building

MARCH 14

10 a.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine ways to reform the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) system.

SD-342

APRIL 3

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine international fisheries, focusing on management and enforcement.

SR-253

APRIL 8

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the Federal Trade Commission reauthorization.

SR-253

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the digital television transition, focusing on consumers, broadcasters, and converter boxes.

SR-253

APRIL 10

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine phantom traffic.

SR-253

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 12

10:15 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original bill, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

SD-419

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 13

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Legislative Branch Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Government Printing Office, and the Office of Compliance.

SD-124

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1785–S1823

Measures Introduced: Three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2737–2739, and S. Res. 477–478. **Page S1818**

Measures Reported:

S. 1638, to adjust the salaries of Federal justices and judges, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1818**

Measures Passed:

United States and the Kingdom of Thailand: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 66, commemorating the 175th anniversary of the commencement of the special relationship between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1822**

Crimes in Guatemala: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178, expressing the sympathy of the Senate to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the United States to work with Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S1823**

Reid (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 4149, to amend the resolution. **Page S1823**

Reid (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 4150, to amend the preamble. **Page S1823**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution: Senate began consideration of S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal

year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

Pages S1791–S1814

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at approximately 11 a.m., on Tuesday, March 11, 2008, for debate only and that all time during any morning business period count against the time allotted for the resolution; provided further, that the recess time be charged equally against each side.

Page S1814

Messages from the House:

Page S1816

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Pages S1816, S1875

Measures Read the First Time:

Pages S1816, S1822–23

Executive Communications:

Pages S1816–17

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S1818–19

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S1819–21

Additional Statements:

Pages S1815–18

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S1821–22

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S1822

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:19 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 11, 2008. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1823.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 5561–5574; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 313; and H. Res. 1032–1033 were introduced. **Pages H1444–45**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1445–46**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed on March 6, 2008 as follows:

H.R. 2176, to provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Bay Mills Indian Community, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–541, Pt. 1) and

H.R. 4115, to provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–542, Pt. 1).

A report was filed on March 7, 2008 as follows:

H. Con. Res. 312, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 (H. Rept. 110–543).

Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 936, honoring the 200th anniversary of the Gallatin Report on Roads and Canals, celebrating the national unity the Gallatin Report engendered, and recognizing the vast contributions that national planning efforts have provided to the United States, with amendments (H. Rept. 110–544);

H.R. 5492, to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to construct a greenhouse facility at its museum support facility in Suitland, Maryland (H. Rept. 110–545);

H.R. 5501, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria (H. Rept. 110–546, Pt. 1); and

H. Res. 1031, providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 895) establishing within the House of Representatives an Office of Congressional Ethics (H. Rept. 110–547). **Pages H1443, H1444**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Hirono to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1419**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:33 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H1419**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Expressing support for the designation and goals of “National 9–1–1 Education Month”:

H. Res. 537, amended, to express support for the designation and goals of “National 9–1–1 Education Month”, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 381 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 108; **Pages H1421–23, H1430**

E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 3196, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, as the “E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building”, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 382 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 109; and **Pages H1423–24, H1430–31**

Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex Designation Act: H.R. 4166, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the “Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex”, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 382 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 110. **Pages H1424–25, H1431–32**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:11 p.m. and reconvened at 6:34 p.m. **Pages H1429–30**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Congratulating Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of leadership and service to the United States and the world as Iowa’s land-grant university: H. Res. 924, amended, to congratulate Iowa State University of Science and Technology for 150 years of leadership and service to the United States and the world as Iowa’s land-grant university; **Pages H1425–27**

Congratulating the University of Kansas (“KU”) football team for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and having the most successful year in program history: H. Res. 948, amended, to congratulate the University of Kansas (“KU”) football team for winning the 2008 FedEx Orange Bowl and having the most successful year in program history; and **Pages H1427–28**

Congratulating the women’s water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, for winning the 2007 NCAA Division I Women’s Water Polo National Championship, and congratulating UCLA on its 100th NCAA sports national title, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history: H. Res. 493, amended, to congratulate the women’s water polo team of the University of California, Los Angeles, for winning the

2007 NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo National Championship, and congratulating UCLA on its 100th NCAA sports national title, making it the most accomplished athletic program in NCAA history.

Pages H1428–29

Permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust: Agreed by unanimous consent to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 306, to permit the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

Page H1432

Authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to honor the 5 years of service and sacrifice of our troops and their families in the war in Iraq and to remember those who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan and throughout the world: The House agreed by unanimous consent to H. Con. Res. 313, to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to honor the 5 years of service and sacrifice of our troops and their families in the war in Iraq and to remember those who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan and throughout the world.

Page H1432

Recess: The House recessed at 8:55 p.m. and reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

Page H1443

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he announced his veto of H.R. 2082, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and explained his reasons therefor—ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–100).

Pages H1419–20

Subsequently, the House agreed to the Loeb sack motion to postpone further consideration of the veto message and bill until Tuesday, March 11th.

Page H1420

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1421.

Senate Referrals: S. 2733 was held at the desk.

Page H1421

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1430, H1430–31, and H1431. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Committee Meeting

ESTABLISHING WITHIN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AN OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for the adoption of H. Res. 895, which establishes an Office of Congressional Ethics within the House of Representatives, with the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report upon adoption of the rule.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2008

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: to hold hearings to examine the effectiveness of the United States efforts to combat corruption, waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 for U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces in Korea, and the future years defense program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the condition of the nation's infrastructure, focusing on proposals for needed improvements, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Innovation, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2009 to support U.S. basic research, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Transportation's Cross-Border Truck pilot program, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program, and the implementation of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 (Pub. L. 110–114), 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine evaluating United States policy options on the Horn of Africa, 10:15 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), focusing on enlargement and effectiveness, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the broken pipeline, focusing on losing opportunities in the life sciences, 11 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Grace C. Becker, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense cooperation and collaboration, focusing on caring for families of wounded warriors, 9:30 a.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Research, Education and Economic budget request, 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, on OJP/COPS/OVW, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol, and on Secretary of Commerce, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, on Air Force Posture, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on DOE—Energy and Conservation, Fossil Energy, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, 10 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services, and General Government, on Consumer Product Safety Commission, 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Citizenship and Immigration Services: Strengthening legal immigration and improving refugee processing, 10 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn, and on Homeland Security Grants: Supporting a National Preparedness and Response System, 2 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, on National Endowment for the Humanities, 4 p.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Implications of a Weakening Economy for Training and Employment Services, 10 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies, on Navy Budget, 1:30 p.m., H-143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, on HIV/AIDS and Global Health Programs, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, joint hearing on Department of the Navy and Air Force Tactical Aviation Programs, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Impact of the Administration's signing statement on the Department of Defense's implementation of the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act, 12 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on Inherently Governmental—What is the Proper Role of Government? 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education, hearing on After School Programs: How the Bush Ad-

ministration's Budget Impacts Children and Families, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to continue mark up of H.R. 1108, Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1198, Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2007; H.R. 2464, Wakefield Act; H.R. 1237, Cytology Proficiency Improvement Act of 2007; H.R. 3701, Keeping Seniors Safe From Falls Act of 2007; H.R. 2063, Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis, Management Act of 2007; H.R. 3825, Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007; and H.R. 1418, Reauthorization of the Traumatic Brain Injury Act, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing entitled "The Role of Private Equity in the Communications Marketplace, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, hearing on the oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Department's budget request for fiscal year 2009 and oversight of emergency spending, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy, Trade and Technology, hearing on H.R. 5512, Coin Modernization and Taxpayer Savings Act of 2008, 2:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Middle East, and South Asia, and the Subcommittee on Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight, joint hearing on Neglected Responsibilities: the U.S. Response to the Iraqi Refugee Crisis, 2 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Task Force on Competition Policy and Antitrust Laws, hearing on Net Neutrality and Free Speech on the Internet, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on Deferred Prosecution: Should Corporate Settlement Agreements Be Without Guidelines? 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on Department of Homeland Security Law Enforcement Operations, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Resources, oversight hearing on Getting Royalties Right: Recent Recommendations for Improving the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty System, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on the following measures: H.R. 2964, Captive Primate Safety Act; and H.R. 5534, Bear Protection Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, hearing on Advancements and Continual Challenges in the Parole, Supervised Release and Revocation of D.C. Code Offenders, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization and Procurement, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 752, Federal Electronic Equipment Donation Act of

2007; H.R. 3033, Contractors and Federal Spending Accountability Act of 2007; H.R. 3928, Government Contractor Accountability Act of 2007; and H.R. 4881, Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2007, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census and National Archives, hearing on Privacy: The Use of Commercial Information Resellers by Federal Agencies, 2 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, hearing on National Security and Latin America: Challenges and Opportunities on Energy Cooperation, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider a resolution Revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, 3:30 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on the Transfer

of Nanotechnology Initiative Research Outcomes for Commercial and Public Benefit, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on the NIST's Fiscal year 2009 Budget Request: What Are the Right Technology Investments to Promote U.S. Innovation and Competitiveness, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on Comprehensive Watershed Management and Planning: Drought-related Issues in the Southeastern United States, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Substance Abuse/Co-morbid Disorders: Comprehensive Solutions to a Complex Problem, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's annual report on Medicare payment policies, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Advanced R&D Budget, 10 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, March 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 60 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 70, Budget Resolution, for debate only.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 11

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday:

Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H.R. 5492—To authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to construct a greenhouse facility at its museum support facility in Suitland, Maryland; (2) H. Res. 936—Honoring the 200th anniversary of the Gallatin Report on Roads and Canals, celebrating the national unity the Gallatin Report engendered, and recognizing the vast contributions that national planning efforts have provided to the United States; (3) H. Res. 854—Expressing gratitude to all of the member states of the Inter-

national Commission of the International Tracing Service (ITS) on ratifying the May 2006 Agreement to amend the 1955 Bonn Accords granting open access to vast Holocaust and other World War II related archives located in Bad Arolsen, Germany; (4) H. Con. Res. 290—Commemorating the 175th anniversary of the special relationship between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand; (5) H. Res. 1024—Recognizing the 187th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American Democracy; (6) H. Res. 945—Raising awareness and promoting education on the criminal justice system by establishing March 2008 as “National Criminal Justice Month”; (7) H.R. 4056—The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Congressional Badge of Bravery Act of 2008; (8) H.R. 1312—Arts Require Timely Service (ARTS) Act; (9) H.R. 3361—To make technical corrections related to the Pension Protection Act of 2006; (10) H.R. 5563—Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education (GIVE) Act; (11) S. 2733—To temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965; and (12) H. Res. 953—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and their families. Vote on the President's Veto of H.R. 2082—The Intelligence Authorization Act of 2008. Consideration of H. Res. 895—Establishing within the House of Representatives an Office of Congressional Ethics (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E335, E339
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E337
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E341
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E340
Costa, Jim, Calif., E340
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E337
Davis, Tom, Va., E335, E336, E337, E338, E339

Farr, Sam, Calif., E343
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E338, E341
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E340, E342, E343
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E341
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E335
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E342
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E336
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E339
Poe, Ted, Tex., E340

Reynolds, Thomas M., N.Y., E336
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E336
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E336
Smith, Adrian, Nebr., E340, E341, E343
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E335, E336, E337, E339
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E341
Westmoreland, Lynn A., Mac, Ga., E338
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E335, E338



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.